

CITY OF GRIDLEY GENERAL PLAN

HOUSING ELEMENT

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL
STUDIES LIBRARY

NOV 6 1986


UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

SUPPORT DOCUMENT

June, 1984

This is the 1984 Update of the Gridley Housing Element. It complies with all requirements of Section 65588, Article 10.6 of the California Government Code requiring such an update. The official required adoption date of this update is January 1, 1986.

Earl D. Nelson & Associates
500 Wall Street
Chico, Ca. 95926



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024

<https://archive.org/details/C124889671>

CITY OF GRIDLEY HOUSING ELEMENT

CONTENTS

	Page
Table of Contents	i
List of Tables	iii
INTRODUCTION.....	1
THE HOUSING PROBLEM.....	2
Introduction and Methodology	2
COMMUNITY CHARACTERISTICS.....	3
Population, Households and Group Quarters	7
Household Size	9
Age	10
Ethnic Background	12
Employment	14
Household Income	23
Households With Special Needs	27
HOUSING STOCK CHARACTERISTICS.....	31
Housing Type	31
Tenure	31
Occupancy	33
Housing Value and Rent	34
Housing Age and Condition	39
Overcrowding	44
ANALYSIS OF NEED.....	46
A. Existing Needs	47
Affordability	47
Overpayment	51
Availability of Vacant Units:	
Value: (Affordability).....	52
Vacancy Rates and Housing Availability	55
Condition of Vacant Units	58
Habitability	58
Overcrowding	59
Special Needs	59
B. Projected Needs (1984 through 1989)	60
Affordability	60
Methodology: Regional Allocation Plan	60
Projected Need Theoretical and Actual	66
Habitability	68
Overcrowding	68
Special Needs	69

CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
CONSTRAINTS ON HOUSING AVAILABILITY.....	72
Market Constraints	72
Cost Factors	72
Land Cost	76
Site Development Costs	76
Construction Costs	77
Interest Rates	77
Types of Units Available	78
Governmental Constraints	79
Land Availability	79
Development Impact Fees for Off-Site Improvements	86
On-Site Improvements	88
Permit Processing	88
Building Codes and Enforcement	89
City Housing and Growth Management Policies ..	89
Use of Federal and State Programs	90
Availability of Infrastructure	91
Summary of Housing Constraints	95
SUMMARY OF HOUSING NEEDS.....	98

REFERENCES

APPENDICES

- * A. 1983 Community Development Survey
- * B. 1984 DOF Population Estimates
- * C. Housing Built 1983-84
- * D. Butte County Regional Allocation Plan Projections
- * E. Master Development Fee Schedule

LIST OF TABLES

Table No.	TITLE	Page
1	Total Population	4
1-A	Total Population, 1980-1984	4
2	Household Population and Size	6
3	Projected Household Number and Size for 1989 - City of Gridley	9
4	1980 Age Distribution	10
5	Estimate Future Age Distribution - Butte County	11
6	Elderly Households	11
7	1980 Population Distribution by Ethnic Background	12
8	Tenure by Race and Spanish Origin	14
9	1980 Employment Status: City of Gridley, Gridley Area	16
10-A	Employment by Industry, 1980	18
10-B	Work Location - City of Gridley, 1980	19
10-C	Travel Time to Work - City of Gridley, 1980 .	19
11	Agriculture-Related Employment	21
12	Primary Crops Grown in Gridley Vicinity	22
13	Gridley Income Profiles: 1980, 1983	26
14	Comparison of Average Income: City of Gridley, Butte County	27
15	Female-Headed Households	27
16	Disabled Persons in Gridley	30
17	Housing Types	32
18	Household Tenure	33
19-A	Home Value - Gridley Area	34

LIST OF TABLES
(continued)

	Page
19-B Contract Rent - Gridley Area	36
20-A Home Value - Gridley City	37
20-B Contract Rent - Gridley City	38
21 Age of Housing: 1970	42
22 Units Lacking Complete Plumbing for Exclusive Use	42
23 Housing Condition, Gridley, 1975	43
24 City of Gridley - County Comparison of Housing Condition	43
25 Household Overcrowding	45
26 Estimated Occupancy Conditions in Gridley City, 1983	49
27 Overpayment for Housing	54
28 Value Distribution of Vacant Units - 1983 ...	55
29 Vacancy Rates - Gridley, 1983	56
30 Housing Availability, 1983	57
31 BCAG's Income Group Proportions	62
32 Units Needed to be Built Per Year, 1984-1989 - Gridley City	64
33 Comparison Table: New Units to Accommodate Projected Gridley Household Increase Based on Butte County's Population Projection	65
34 Theoretical Projected Need by Income Group, 1984-1989	66
35 Residual Housing Needs as of 1984	67
36 Projected Housing Need by Income Group, 1984-89	68

LIST OF TABLES
(continued)

	Page
37 City of Gridley Building Permits Issued Per Year	73
38 1981 Home Price Survey	74
39 Changes in Share of Major Cost of Components for a Typical Single Family House - State of California	75
40 Summary of Land Availability Analysis: Additional Units Possible in Gridley, 1982-1987	83
41 Additional Land Needed for Housing-Gridley City, 1984-1989	84
41-A Adequate sites In Relation to Housing Need 1984-1989	85
42 Summary of Gridley Area Housing Needs, 1984-1989	99

GRIDLEY HOUSING ELEMENT

SUPPORT DOCUMENT

INTRODUCTION

This Support Document of Gridley's General Plan Housing Element contains the background data and analysis which provides the basis for understanding the City's housing goals, policies and objectives. (The latter are found in the Housing Element Summary Document.) First the community is described in terms of its population and households; then follows a description of the housing stock; the nature of Gridley's housing needs is outlined; and finally the factors constraining new housing starts are described. The product of analyzing all of this information is a quantification of Gridley's annual housing needs for the five-year period from 1984 through 1989; these needs are summarized in both this Support Document and in the Housing Element Summary Document.

The unit of study for the element is primarily the incorporated City of Gridley. Some information is given for the Gridley County Census District (CCD), closely approximated by the Gridley High School District, for background purposes and where the Gridley area as a whole is treated as one market area. The time frame of the Element is 1984 to 1989. The 1980 U.S. Census Summary Tape Files 1A and 3A were used as primary information sources, as was a special 1983 Gridley Community Development Survey, and interviews with local planning, real estate, housing, employment, farmworker aid, and other agencies. This document is

a revision of the 1983 Housing Element, (revised and adopted March 1984).

THE HOUSING PROBLEM

Introduction and Methodology

An effective housing program must base its strategy for action on accurate, recent information about the community needs and about the particular obstacles or constraints to meeting those needs. These needs and constraints must be defined for the present and as much as possible, projected for the future (1989). The first part of defining the community's needs is describing the existing population; then the housing stock as it exists now must be characterized. From this information the needs for specific types of housing and housing for specific groups within the population, as well as in particular locations, can be identified quantitatively. Likely future needs can be estimated based on projections of current trends. The most current characteristics of households and their dwellings within the City of Gridley are obtained from a special Community Development Survey taken in April of 1983 (Appendix A), while the 1980 U.S. Census provides the most current demographic background. Finally, determination of the City's responsibilities for providing housing for low-income household is guided by its fair share of the regional housing need in the Gridley-Biggs market area allocated by the Butte County Association of Governments in March, 1984.

Data describing community characteristics and the housing

stock for the unincorporated area surrounding Gridley is included in this Element for informational purposes. The analysis of housing needs and the housing program are for the City of Gridley itself.

COMMUNITY CHARACTERISTICS

The community of Gridley (incorporated and surround unincorporated) will be described here in terms of six main characteristics relating to housing needs:

1. Population, number of households and group quarters
2. Household size
3. Age
4. Ethnic background
5. Employment
6. Income

In addition, five groups within the population having special needs for housing are described in further detail:

1. Female-headed households
2. Elderly
3. Seasonal farmworkers
4. Handicapped
5. Emergency shelter for the homeless

1. Population, Households and Group Quarters

Although for general planning purposes it is essential to know the total population, for housing needs assessment the most valuable piece of data is number of households. Table 1 shows total population and growth rates, while Table 2 focuses on

households.

TABLE 1
TOTAL POPULATION

	a 1970	b 1975	a 1980	Overall	Percent Increase		
					1970-80	1975-80	Amount
State	20,058,103	-----	23,668,582	18.0	1.67	-----	----
Butte Co.	101,969	120,901	143,851	41.1	3.5	19.0	3.5
Gridley-CCD	7,808	8,059 ^c	8,836	13.2	1.24	9.6	1.86
Gridley-City	3,534	3,632	3,982	12.7	1.20	9.6	1.86

Source: a) 1970 and 1980 figures from 1980 U.S. Census, Advanced and Final Counts
b) 1975 figures from 1975 Butte County Special Census
c) Derived by applying 0.945, ratio of Gridley CCD 1970 population to the 1970 Gridley High School District (HSD) population, to the 1975 HSD population. 1975 Special Census.

TABLE 1-A
TOTAL POPULATION, 1980-1984

	a 1980	b 1983	b 1984	1980-84	Percent Increase		
					Annual	1970-84	Annual
Butte Co.	143,851	154,056	157,130	9.2%	2.22%	54.1%	3.14%
Gridley (City)	3,982	4,091	4,188	5.2%	1.27%	18.5%	1.22%

Source: a) 1980 U.S. Census

b) State Department of Finance, 5/1/84 est.

From Tables 1 and 1-A it can be seen that Gridley has grown at between 1% and 2% per year since 1970, with the latest rate, 1.27%, being very close to the average of 1.22% for the

entire data period 1970=1984. It can also be seen that Gridley has been growing significantly more slowly than Butte County as a whole; its growth rate has been about half of the County's.

Population Projection

For purposes of projecting populations, the 1984 Department of Finance estimates of population have been adopted for 1983 and 1984.*

These data, contained in Appendix B, provide the "base" used for projection to 1989. Assumptions used for projecting Gridley's population are:

1. Household population will continue to grow at the most recent rate of population growth - 1.27% per year.
2. The number in Group Quarters will remain the same -92.
3. Household size will decline at a rate of .006 persons per year, from 2.532 in 1984. This is a 0.25% per year decline, a less rapid decline than that assumed in the previous Element (0.74% per year). Household size is discussed further below. See Table 2-A for projection of both total and household populations to 1989.

*These differ only by 1 to 2% from projections reached by applying projection methodology and assumptions from the previous Element to the number of households counted in the 1983 CDS.

The number of households in 1980 is shown in Table 2-A; the 1983 CDS showed 1,622 households (or occupied housing units). Household numbers for 1984 are provided by the California Department of Finance. (These figures are within 1 to 2% of those which could be calculated using Gridley CDS statistics.) The projected number of households for 1989, based on the methodology in Table 3, is 1,745. This would be approximately a 7.8% increase in households over 1984, while household population would increase by 6.5%.

TABLE 2
HOUSEHOLD POPULATION AND SIZE

A. Household Population

	1980			
	<u>Total Population</u>	<u>Population In Group Quarters</u>	<u>Household Population</u>	<u>Number Of Households</u>
Butte County	143,851	3,887	139,964	56,904
Gridley CCD	8,836	107	8,729	3,106
Gridley City	3,982	92	3,890	1,522

1984, 1989

	<u>Total Population</u>	<u>Population in Group Quarters</u>	<u>Household Population</u>	<u>Number of Household</u>
Gridley (City)				
1984	4,188	92	4,096	1,618
1989	4,454	92	4,362	1,745

Source: 1984: DOF 5/1/84 estimates

1989: Table 3. Assume constant population in group quarters.

B. Average Household Size

	1984	^a 1980	^b 1975	1970
Butte County		2.46	2.56	^a 2.82
Gridley CCD		2.81	2.91	^c 3.01
Gridley City	^e 2.532	2.56	2.66	^d 2.76

Source: a) 1980 U.S. Census, Advanced Counts

b) Butte County 1975 Special Census

c) Estimated based on 3.76% decline in household size from 1975-1980

d) Estimated based on 3.44% decline in household size from 1975-1980

e) DOF estimate, 5/1/84

2. Household Size

As Table 2-B shows, household size in the Gridley area has been significantly higher than in the County as a whole, especially in the urbanized area outside Gridley's city limits. The 1,584 households outside the city limits in 1980 had an average household size of 3.05, compared to the average household size of 2.56 within incorporated Gridley. This is probably due to the large concentration of farmworkers with large families living in the outer Gridley area (Butte County Draft H.E., 1980, p.II-17), and the higher proportion of elderly households within the City Limits.

As seen from Table 2-B, household size has declined over the years in Gridley and the region as well. This decline was reversed with a slight increase in household size in 1983-1984, according to 5/1/84 DOF figures. This phenomenon is typical of

communities all over the State, reflecting "doubling up" of individuals and families within one housing unit, which increases the size of the household. This is seen as a temporary response to the recent (1980-84) recessionary economy, and in Gridley, as elsewhere in the State, a slight decline in household size is anticipated over the long term (C. Cleary, HCD staff). The decrease from 2.532 to 2.50 persons per household is considered to represent a reasonable rate of household size decline for the next five-year period.

TABLE 3

PROJECTED HOUSEHOLD NUMBER AND SIZE FOR 1989-GRIDLEY CITY

1. Projected Population

1.27% annual growth rate 1980-1984 (1980 U.S. Census,
1984 DOF estimate).

Multiplier = 1.0127

Assume same annual growth rate 1984-1989

1984 Household population: 4,095 (1984 DOF estimates)

$4,095 (1.0127^5) = 4,362$ 1989 Household Population

2. Projected Average Household Number and Size

Assume annual decline of 0.25% per year for 1984-1989.

Multiplier = $1 - .25\% = 1 - 0.0025 = 0.9975$

1984 HH size: 2.532 (1984 DOF estimates)

$2,532 (0.9975^5) = 2.50$ 1989 Average Household Size

3. $4,362 / 2.50 = 1,745$ 1989 Number of Households

4. $1,745 - 1,618 =$ a 127 HH increase over 1984.

an increase of 7.85% of HH's, at an annual growth
rate of 1.52%.

3. Age

TABLE 4

1980 AGE DISTRIBUTION

Age Class	Gridley City		Gridley CCD		County		State	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0-17	1,103	28	2,677	30	32,713	23		27
18-64	2,118	53	4,843	55	88,347	61		63
65 and over	761	19	1,316	15	22,251	16		10

Source: 1980 U.S. Census

Table 4 shows that the Gridley area's age distribution differs somewhat from both the County and the State. The Gridley population has larger percentages of retired people and minor children than the County and State averages. Furthermore, the Census data show that the Gridley area's older population is more concentrated within the incorporated city limits, while the minor children are somewhat more predominant in the surrounding unincorporated area. If Gridley area's population structure follows the trend in the County, indicated in Table 5, the proportions of children and elderly will rise while the economically productive age group (18-64) declines. Census data on numbers of households with elderly members are shown in Table 6. The 1983 Community Development Survey shows 29% of all households with one or more members 65 and over. This is not significantly different from 1980 data in Table 6 representing 33% of all households with persons 65 and over. These 1980 Census and 1983 CDS data are the most recent on age structure in Gridley.

TABLE 5

ESTIMATED FUTURE AGE DISTRIBUTION - BUTTE COUNTY

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Under 18</u>	<u>18-64</u>	<u>65 and over</u>
1980	143,655	32,466 (22.6%)	89,928 (62.6%)	21,260 (14.8%)
1985	161,555	35,920 (22.2%)	100,719 (62.3%)	24,916 (15.4%)
1990	179,030	41,22 (23.0%)	109,985 (61.4%)	27,823 (15.5%)

Source: Butte County Draft Housing Element (1981).

Base Population Figure: 1980 U.S. Census, Preliminary Counts.

Age Specific Growth Rates: Department of Finance,
Population Projections, Series F-150.

TABLE 6

ELDERLY HOUSEHOLDS

	<u>1980</u>
	a
Gridley	517
	b
	(488)
	a
Gridley CCD	906
	b
	(845)

Source: 1980 U.S. Census

a) Table 22 in 1980 Census-Households with Persons 65 and over.

b) Table 23 in 1980 Census-Households with Householder 65 and over.

4. Ethnic Background

According to the most recent data provided by 1980 U.S. Census, the Gridley area population is about three-quarters white and one fifth of Mexican or Spanish origin, with other minority groups less well represented (see Table 7).

TABLE 7

1980 POPULATION DISTRIBUTION BY ETHNIC BACKGROUND

	Gridley City			Gridley CCD		
	Percentage of Whole Population	Percentage of Minority Population		Percentage of Whole Population	Percentage of Minority Population	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>No.</u>		<u>No.</u>	<u>No.</u>	
Total Population	3,982	100		8,836	100	
White	2,942	74		6,256	71	
Black	2	0.1	0.2	12	0.1	0.5
Spanish Origin	683	17	65	1,678	19	65
American Indian	27	0.5	2.0	41	0.5	1.6
Asian	36	0.9	3.5	145	1.6	5.6
Other	298	7.5	29	704	8	27
Subtotal: Minority Population	1,040	26		2,580	29	

Source: 1980 Census, Advance Counts
Vince Torres-Gill, California Department of Finance

Concentration of minorities in one part of town does not seem to occur in Gridley (BCHA staff). Economic status has worsened for many non-minorities over recent years, so that a low and unstable income is increasingly an attribute of the white population as well as substantial portion of the non-white population. A difference in ability to own a home still exists, however, probably due to lower incomes and instability of employment among farm laborers. The 1980 Census (Gridley CCD) indicates that 64% of non-white households rent their housing, while only 30% of white households are renters (see Table 8). Almost three-quarters (74%) of households of Spanish origin rent their living quarters.

Proportionally, more minorities (mostly of Spanish origin) are renters outside of the city limits than within. Within the City, 51% of minority households are renters while 38% of white households are renters. This data is as of the 1980 U.S. Census and is assumed not to have changed significantly.

TABLE 8

TENURE BY RACE AND SPANISH ORIGIN

<u>Households</u>	Gridley		City of Gridley	
	<u>Total</u>	<u>Renters</u>	<u>Percentage of Renters</u>	<u>Percentage of Renters</u>
White	2,727	827	30	
Black	4	0	0	
American Indian	18	8	44	
Asian	51	15	29	
Spanish Origin				
Non-White	299	221	74	
Subtotals				
White	2,727	827	30	38
Non-White	379	244	64	51
TOTAL	3,106	1,071	34	40

Source: 1980 U.S. Census, Tables 27 and 28.

5. Employment

Present

The 1980 U.S. Census shows (Table 9) that Gridley has about the same level of unemployment as the County, but a much lower level of employment because there are fewer people in the work force. This reflects Gridley's older age structure and high proportion of retired people, especially within the City Limits. This is still expected to be true as of the 1984-89 planning period. Although the 1980 Census shows Gridley's unemployment rate in 1979 at 6 to 7 percent, it appears to have risen since then, since the 1983 Community Development Survey shows 9%

unemployment (heads of households). No new significant income generators have come to Gridley in that time (1979-1983), while downtown businesses have continued closing down. During that time unemployment has risen in general, in response to nationwide economic recession.

Future

Prediction of Gridley's unemployment is difficult because the health of the local agricultural economy is tied to that of the national economy, which is an unknown factor.

Assuming that the national and local economies remain at present levels, unemployment can be estimated to be within a range from 6 to 10% (somewhat higher than shown in the 1980 Census). In addition, if Gridley's population continues to age without significant additions of working people, the proportion "not in the labor force" can be expected to rise slightly by 1989. By the end of the planning period, Gridley may begin to experience increases in employment levels and demographic shifts (e.g., younger age structure) reflecting the statewide trend towards migration to rural areas observed to be taking place. If so, these shifts will be reflected in the 1990 Housing Element review and revision.

Recently Heinz U.S.A., a division of H.J. Heinz Company of Pittsburgh, has secured the necessary planning entitlements to relocate their rice processing (Chico-San) plant in the City of Gridley. Approximately 80 persons will be employed at start-up.

Effects on housing are expected to be minimal as most

employees reside in northern Butte County (Chico) near the existing plant facility. The expected rate of housing demand generated by this project can easily be absorbed by the City within the Housing Element's planning period 1984-1989.

In the long term we can anticipate that some employees will relocate in the Gridley area and when the plant expands sometime after 1990, new employees will be added. The plant is expected to be in operation in spring, 1986. The impact, if any, of the plant on housing or employment trends will need to be assessed in the 1990-1995 Housing Element Update.

TABLE 9

1980 EMPLOYMENT STATUS: CITY OF GRIDLEY, GRIDLEY AREA

<u>Employment Status</u>	<u>City of Gridley</u>	<u>Gridley Area*</u>	<u>Butte County</u>
Employed	41.0%	45.0%	56.0%
Unemployed	6.5%	7.0%	6.5%
Not in Labor Force (Retire and Misc. Other)	52.5%	48.0%	37.5%

Source: 1980 U.S. Census, STF 3

Table 10A shows that Gridley residents work mainly in the retail trade and agricultural industries, with educational services and non-durable good manufacturing also employing significant proportions. Table 10B shows that almost as many people work outside of Gridley (43%) as within the City (57%). Census information on travel time to work (Table 10C) reveals two peaks-one at 5-9 minutes (30% of responding workers) and a second at 30-44 minutes (13.5%). This probably indicates that many of

those who do not work in Gridley work in Chico (30-40 minutes away) or Marysville-Yuba City (30 minutes away).

*Gridley CCD outside City Limits only.

TABLE 10A

EMPLOYMENT BY INDUSTRY - CITY OF GRIDLEY, 1980

<u>Industry</u>	<u>Respondents</u>	<u>%</u>
Agriculture, forestry, fisheries & mining	195	16
Construction	42	
Nondurable goods mfg.	112	9
Durable goods mfg.	97	
Transportation	34	
Communications & other public utilities	29	
Wholesale trade	39	
Retail trade	225	18
Finance, insurance, real estate	33	
Business & repair services	72	
Personal, entertainment, recreation services	61	
Health services	77	
Educational services	110	9
Other professional & related services	54	
Public administration	53	

Total responding	1233	

Source: 1980 U.S. Census, STF 3

TABLE 10B

WORK LOCATION - CITY OF GRIDLEY, 1980

	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>
Living in City of Gridley Worked in Gridley	588	57
Worked outside of Gridley but in Butte County	313	30
Worked outside of Butte County	137	13
	---	--
Total	1038	100

Source: 1980 U.S. Census, STF 3

TABLE 10C

TRAVEL TIME TO WORK - CITY OF GRIDLEY, 1980

<u>Travel Time (Min)</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
0 - 4	142	12.0
5 - 9	339	29.5
10 - 14	206	18.0
15 - 19	143	12.5
20 - 29	102	9.0
30 - 44	155	13.5
45 - 59	46	4.0
60 +	16	1.5
	---	----
Total Respondents	1149	100

Source: 1980 U.S. Census, STF 3

Migrant Labor Force

Numbers

The Gridley area, especially the unincorporated area surrounding the City, contains the highest concentration of migrant farmworkers in Butte County. Estimating the number of farm laborers and their families in the Gridley area is difficult since the numbers change with the season and since many non-U.S. citizens go unrecorded. According to the State Employment Development Department (EDD), Butte County had an annual average of 3,300 farm workers in 1981.

The Butte County Housing Authority (BCHA) farm labor and low income projects house approximately 900 - 1,000 farm labor residents and (according to local staff) many more workers and their families reside elsewhere around Gridley and on the farms themselves. Regional EDD staff estimates that Gridley supports about half of Butte County's farm labor population; thus the Gridley area serves as the residence for perhaps 1,500 - 1,800 farm laborers and their families on an annual average, the number possibly rising to about 2,000 in the summer. The number of farmworkers residing within the City Limits is not known.

Seasonality

Both BCHA and EDD sources as well as Butte County Agricultural Commissioner staff have indicated that for various reasons the marked seasonality of farm labor presence in Gridley is noticeably declining. Rather than the large spring influx and

fall exodus of laborers, the farm labor population has been stabilizing. People are now staying through the winter seeking other work in agriculture-related industry (See Table 13 below) or other areas and also receiving unemployment insurance. Many families go to Mexico over the Christmas holidays and to Washington in early summer to pick fruit, while maintaining their Gridley residences. Local BCHA staff estimates that only 5% of those housed in the BCHA farm labor projects are truly migratory workers. Mechanization of farm practices has reduced the numbers of laborers needed in the summer working directly with the crops while giving rise to jobs in other areas less seasonal in nature such as farm machinery manufacture and repair. Table 11 lists the agriculture-related industries employing a good portion of Gridley's overall population.

Crops

The primary crops grown in the Gridley area are listed in Table 12.

TABLE 11

AGRICULTURE-RELATED EMPLOYMENT

Rice Storage Mills (RGA)

Trucking

Farm Machinery Manufacture

Farm Machinery Repair

Cannery

Prune Drier Distributors (Sunsweet)

Chemicals (Fertilizers and Pesticides)

Crop Dusting

Nurseries

TABLE 12

PRIMARY CROPS GROWN IN GRIDLEY VICINITY

Prunes

Peaches

Walnuts

Kiwi

Rice

Source: Butte County Agricultural Commissioner, Gridley Office

Peaches, historically the primary crop around Gridley, are declining, while kiwi farming is becoming more popular. Kiwi farming is more labor intensive all year around, which would tend to reinforce the trend of farmworkers to stabilize.

Ethnic Origin

BCHA staff indicates that almost all farmworkers in the Gridley area are of Mexican or Mexican-American ethnic origin, with a low percentage of other ethnic groups represented.

Income

Not all farmworker families have low income, according to BCHA director John Bowling. Many families have multiple incomes and receive unemployment insurance so are not necessarily in the very lowest income brackets.

6. Household Income

Gridley household income data for both 1980 and 1983 can be distributed according to income level categories as shown in Table 13. The categories have their origins in both Federal and State agencies with responsibility for providing housing assistance corresponding to a family's income deficiency. For example, the "Very Low Income" Category represents a set of income limits by family size used by HUD in administering programs for publicly-assisted housing. For 1980, households reporting incomes (in the 1980 U.S., Census) within the dollar value brackets shown in Table 13A approximate the numbers of households whose incomes fell below the HUD income limits for that year. For 1983, data from the 1983 CDS was used in the following way:

1. The dollar values for the 1980 income brackets were inflated by a multiplier of 1.22. This is the approximate amount by which incomes rose Statewide from 1979 through 1982, according to HCD.
2. The percentages of 1983 households falling into each income bracket in the 1983 Survey were adjusted to correct for the artificially high HUD program limits used; for probable under-reporting of incomes due to asking only for "earned" income; and to bring Gridley's figures in line with the community of Anderson, California, in which 10% more households fell into the lower two income brackets following a mill closure in 1979, versus the 20% indicated by the 1983 Survey. The ratios of 60% Lower, 40% Moderate and above, come from the Anderson model. Within these two groupings, ratios from the 1980 census-based Gridley income profile were applied. The 1983 CDS income distribution is revised as follows:

	<u>Original</u>	<u>Revised</u>
Very Low	43%	39%
Low	31%	21%
Moderate	11%	16%
High	15%	24%

Thus the information from the 1983 survey indicating a drop in incomes in 1980-83 is presented according to more realistic assumptions.

The income profile resulting from the 1983 survey showed incomes significantly lower than the 1980 U.S. Census, indicating at least in part the effect of three years of recession and unemployment (see comparison in Table 13). There is some question, indicated by State Census Data Center staff, as to the accuracy of resident-reported income figures as presented in any Census; these incomes could be under- or over- reported by some unknown amounts, and may or may not include government income or rent subsidies. These "hidden" factors make analysis and comparisons (e.g. 1980 Census vs. 1983 Survey) somewhat unreliable. However, the lower 1983 incomes do match the depressed economy within Gridley in the commercial sector (see also discussion on employment), which together give a general indication of lowered purchasing power in the early 1980's.

The 1983 Survey results also show that 43% of households surveyed received all or a portion of their incomes from government sources.

1980 U.S. Census data show that Gridley City incomes were, on the average, lower than those in the unincorporated areas around the City (CCD) and lower than Butte County as a whole (see Table 14). In view of 1983 Survey results, this relationship to Butte County incomes is presumed to continue, or with perhaps an even greater discrepancy, for the period 1984-89.

TABLE 13

GRIDLEY INCOME PROFILES: 1980, 1983
(Households)

A. 1980

<u>Income Bracket</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Very Low Income (under \$7,350)	502	33
Low Income (\$7,350-\$11,760)	260	18
Moderate Income (\$11,760-\$17,640)	296	19
High Income (over \$17,640)	463	30
TOTALS	1,521 (of 1,522 Households)	100

B. 1983

Very Low Income (under \$8,967)	632	39
Low Income (\$8,967-\$14,347)	341	21
Moderate Income (\$14,347-\$21,521)	260	16
High Income (over \$21,521)	389	24
TOTALS	1,622 (Number of occupied Units found in 1983 CDS)	100

Source: 1980 U.S. Census, STF 3
1983 CDS
5/31/84 conversation with Don Crow, HCD

TABLE 14

**COMPARISON OF AVERAGE INCOME:
CITY OF GRIDLEY, BUTTE COUNTY**

	1980 Median <u>Household Income</u>
City of Gridley	\$ 11,736
Gridley CCD (Unincorporated Gridley area)	\$ 13,901
Butte County	\$ 13,012

Source: 1980 U.S. Census, STF 3

Households with Special Needs

1. Female-headed households

TABLE 15

FEMALE-HEADED HOUSEHOLDS

	<u>Family</u>	<u>Non-Family</u>	<u>Total</u>	Percentage of All <u>Households</u>	
		a	c	a and c	
Gridley City	144		296	440	27
	b	d			
	(102)	(281)			
Gridley CCD	224	a	c	a and c	
	b	d			
	(159)	(391)	410	634	20

Source: 1980 U.S. Census

(a) Total Family Households

(b) Family with persons under 18 years old.

(c) Total non-family households

(d) Non-family, one-person households

One-fifth of all households in the Gridley area are female-headed; this fraction is slightly higher (28%) in the City

itself.* Most of these households do not have children under 18 (see Table 15 above). Female-headed households generally have much lower incomes, on the average, than male-headed households (38% below poverty levels vs. 6.5% under poverty for male-headed households). Those female-headed families with children have need for safe living and play space and proximity to schools and day care facilities.

2. Elderly Households

See discussion under "Age".

3. Seasonal Farmworkers

See discussion under "Employment".

4. Handicapped

5. Emergency Shelter for the Homeless

See discussion under "Special Needs".

Present

At present the best information on the extent of Gridley's disabled population is contained in the 1980 U.S. Census. The table entitled "Public Transportation Disability" provides an indication of the number of people needing special access provisions. According to specialists in disabled citizen care, transportation disability information gives a good approximation of persons in need of special accommodations in housing. Table 16

*1983 Community Development Survey shows 25% female headed households.

summarizes the Census information, indicating approximately 200 persons in the City and 300 persons in the entire Gridley area who could be in need of housing adaptations.

The 1983 Community Development Survey shows 81 households with a handicapped or disabled resident under 65. Even assuming two disabled persons per household, the number of disabled persons in Gridley is substantially lower than the 1980 U.S. Census would indicate. The 1983 survey shows 186 households with one or more disabled persons of any age. Thus 200 is probably a maximum figure for number of disabled residents in the Gridley Area for 1983.

Future

It is assumed that the percentage of this group in the population will remain fairly constant in the planning period. Thus it can be assumed for the purposes of this element that 5% of the City's population will have this need in 1989. This would amount to 220 persons. Assuming no more than one disabled person per household, these could also be the numbers of housing units potentially needing special adaptations. Some unknown percentage of these units are already adapted by the residents themselves. Although the actual number of units needing attention is unknown, the Census figures as refined by the 1983 Community Development Survey do give some indication of possible magnitude of need.

TABLE 16

DISABLED PERSONS IN GRIDLEY

a

Persons with Transportation Disability

	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
City of Gridley	207	7.1
Gridley Area (CCD)		
Outside City Limits	102	2.9
Total CCD	309	4.8
Butte County	4088	3.6

a

Note: This counts only persons 16-64 years of age not living in institutions.

Source: 1980 U.S. Census, STF3 Table 53

5. Large families

Although information is not available on how many large families are currently living in insufficient space, the 1980 Census gives an indication of possible (potential) need. For the purposes of this Element, a "large family" is defined as one with 4 or more children. The tables for "Number of Persons in Unit" indicate that in 1980 there were 93 households (36 rented) in the City of Gridley with 6 or more members; this represented about 6% of all occupied housing units in 1980. Some fraction of these households may be overcrowded, but the information from the Census (indicating 104 housing units in Gridley with more than 1 person per room) cannot be easily correlated to give the number of large families needing more space. (Please see also the discussion on overcrowding).

HOUSING STOCK CHARACTERISTICS

Housing Type

Of the City's 1,647 housing units in 1980 (including vacant and seasonal units), 1465 or almost 90% were single family dwellings. As seen in Table 17, this number has grown slowly but steadily since 1970 whereas the number of multiple family units stayed fairly steady at about 170 and the number of mobile homes has remained steady at 11. Since 56 Senior Citizen apartments were added to the housing stock between 1980 and 1983, the proportion of single-family dwellings has decreased slightly to its historic 87% proportion.

The number and type of housing units in Gridley as of mid-1984 is shown in Table 17. Housing built 1983-84 is listed in detail in Appendix C.

Tenure

As shown in Table 18, about 60% of units in Gridley City and area are owned, a proportion which has held fairly constant since 1970. This proportion was also found in the 1983 Community Development Survey, as is assumed for 1984-89.

TABLE 17

HOUSING TYPES

<u>Year</u>	<u>Single Family</u>	<u>2 - 4 Units</u>	<u>5 or More Units</u>	<u>Mobilehome Housing</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>% Single Family</u>
1970	1,120	161	21	9	1,311	85
1975	1,241	126	40	11	1,418	88
1976	1,247	126	48	11	1,426	87
1977	1,254	126	48	11	1,439	87
1978	1,343	126	48	11	1,528	88
1979	1,360	126	48	11	1,545	88
1980	1,465		171	11	1,647	90
1983	1,513		227	11	1,751	86
1984	1,544		227	11	1,782	87

Source: 1970-79 - California Department of Finance, Estimates Program
(Elizabeth Hoag)
1980 - U.S. Census Table 55 "Units at Address", as an
indication only.
Multiple-family units not separated into 2-4, 5 or more units.
1983 - CDS, City of Gridley Building Department (48 s.f. units,
56 apts)
1984 - City of Gridley Building Department (31 s.f. units, 0
multi-family)

TABLE 18
HOUSEHOLD TENURE

Ten-Year Comparison and 1989 Projection

	Homeowner Households <u>No.</u>	<u>Percentage</u>	Renter Households <u>No.</u>	<u>Percentage</u>	Total
<u>Gridley City</u>					
1970	742	60	497	40	1,239
1980	914	60	608	40	1,522
1989*	1,047	60	698	40	1,745
<u>GRIDLEY CCD</u>					
1970	---	--	---	--	-----
1980	2,030	65	1,076	35	3,106

Source: 1970, 1980 U.S. Census

OCCUPANCY

According to the 1980 Census, significantly more rental units were vacant than owned units both inside and outside the city limits. The overall vacancy rate from 1980 Census figures is 7% for the City and 6% for the area. A special Gridley Study based on records of utility shutoffs during 1980 revealed 85 units vacant in 1980 and a vacancy rate of about 5%. The April, 1983 Community Development Survey shows a 6.4% overall vacancy rate. Of the 110 vacant units in 1983, 67 were for rent (some of these being apartments and duplexes) and 43 were for sale (all single-family dwellings).

*1983 Projection based on assumption of 60% owned units and 1,745 total occupied units (from population and household size trend projections-see Table 3 in section on Population).

Housing Value and Rent

The 1980 Census provides the following value distributions of owner-occupied units and rent for rental units (Tables 19 and 20).

The 1980 Census median home value is \$48,600 in the area and \$42,800 within the City; median rent is \$128 in the area and \$141 in the city. These values, estimated by the residents themselves, may be inaccurate by some unknown amount. At present, however, this is the only available information on unit value for the entire occupied housing stock for Gridley.

TABLE 19-A

HOME VALUE - GRIDLEY AREA

<u>Housing Unit Value</u>	<u>Number of Units</u>
Less than \$10,000	12
\$10,000 to \$14,999	45
\$15,000 to \$19,999	64
\$20,000 to \$24,999	66
\$25,000 to \$29,999	82
\$30,000 to \$34,999	115
\$35,000 to \$39,999	134
\$40,000 to \$49,999	314
\$50,000 to \$79,999	509
\$80,000 to \$99,999	140
\$100,000 to \$149,999	71
\$150,000 to \$199,999	21
\$200,000 or more	5

Total

1578*

Source: 1980 U.S. Census

*Note: Total is less than the Census total of 1930 for owner-occupied housing units because the value question was not asked at certain categories of units (e.g. mobile homes, units on 10 or more acres).

TABLE 19-B

CONTRACT RENT - GRIDLEY AREA

<u>Contract Rent</u> ^a	<u>Number of Units</u>
Less than \$50	25
\$50 to \$99	218
\$100 to \$119	168
\$120 to \$139	92
\$140 to \$149	29
\$150 to \$159	97
\$160 to \$169	47
\$170 to \$199	88
\$200 to \$249	84
\$250 to \$299	26
\$300 to \$399	15
\$400 to \$499	3
\$500 or more	5
No Cash Rent	62

Total	^b 897

Source: 1980 U.S. Census

a

Some rent figures given in response to this Census question may include subsidies, where rents are partially subsidized, while some figures do not include the subsidy. Census data do not permit clarification of this rent information.

b

Note: Total is less than Census total of 1076 for renter-occupied housing units because the Contract Rent question was not asked at units on 10 or more acres.

TABLE 20-A

HOME VALUE - GRIDLEY CITY

<u>Housing Unit Value</u>	<u>Number of Units</u>
Less than \$10,000	6
\$10,000 to \$14,999	27
\$15,000 to \$19,999	47
\$20,000 to \$24,999	49
\$25,000 to \$29,999	58
\$30,000 to \$34,999	83
\$35,000 to \$39,999	88
\$40,000 to \$49,999	215
\$50,000 to \$79,999	203
\$80,000 to \$99,999	39
\$100,000 to \$149,999	15
\$150,000 to \$199,999	3
\$200,000 or more	2
Total	835*

Source: 1980 U.S. Census, STF 1

*

Note: Total is less than the Census total of 914 for owner-occupied units because the Value question was not asked at certain categories of units (e.g., mobile homes, units on 10 or more acres).

TABLE 20-B

CONTRACT RENT - GRIDLEY CITY

<u>Contract Rent</u>	<u>Number of Units</u>
Less than \$50	16
\$50 to \$99	138
\$100 to \$119	73
\$120 to \$139	54
\$140 to \$149	25
\$150 to \$159	66
\$160 to \$169	38
\$170 to \$199	60
\$200 to \$249	66
\$250 to \$299	18
\$300 to \$399	9
\$400 to \$499	2
\$500 or more	4
No Cash Rent	25
Total	594*

Source: 1980 U.S. Census, STF 1

*Note: Total is less than the Census total of 608 for renter-occupied units because the Contract Rent question was not asked at units on 10 or more acres.

According to realtors and bank loan officers in Gridley, home sales prices in 1982 ranged from \$35,000 to about \$100,000, with a newer three-bedroom home selling for about \$100,000 while a similar older home would sell for \$60,000 to \$70,000. Smaller and older homes would sell for under \$60,000. The average value of the nine single-wide mobile homes in Gridley (in 1982) is unknown but an average single-wide mobile home sells for about \$15,000.

For purposes of establishing housing values for the year 1983, the following assumptions are made in this Element:*

1. Prices of owner-occupied units did not inflate over the period 1980-83. This reflects a marked "flattening" of the Statewide housing cost inflation rate curve for those years.
2. Rents increased at approximately the same rate as incomes (22%) over the period 1980-83. This reflects a persistent Statewide trend observed by HCD staff.

Housing Age and Condition

The U.S. Census shows that Gridley's homes are older, on the average, than those of both the County and the State (see Table 21). Over 50% of the housing stock exceeded 30 years of age (in both 1970 and 1980 Censuses).

The 1980 Census does not include useful information on condition of structure; its only measure of housing unit condition is number of units lacking one or more plumbing facility. These numbers of units, shown below in Table 22 for

*Source: 5/31/84 conversation with Don Crow, HCD Staff

1970 and 1980, are so low as to be of little use in predicting need for rehabilitation or demolition. They are necessarily incomplete, since many other units may be in need of other types of major repair and would not be counted here.

The 1975 Butte County Special Census contains estimates of numbers of dilapidated or deteriorating units (see Table 23); these are based on residents' own judgment, and are to be used as minimum estimates, according to the May, 1981 Butte County Draft Housing Element.

The 1983 Community Development Survey for the City of Gridley has identified (a) those units in need of rehabilitation (units which "materially endanger the health, safety or well-being of its occupants in one or more respects which (are) economically feasible to repair"*) and (b) those units in need of demolition and replacement (as defined for needing rehabilitation except not economically feasible to repair). The 1983 study found 309 units to be in need of either moderate rehabilitation (185 units with moderate structural deficiencies or major rehabilitation (124 units with severe structural deficiencies). This amounts to 18% of the 1983 housing stock. The study also found 24 units to be "borderline" dilapidated, with severe structural deficiencies and a high probability of being unfeasible to repair. This represents about 1.3% of the 1983 housing stock. These numbers are slightly higher than the 1975

* Housing Element Guidelines, Section 6410

Special Census, which showed 13% units needing rehabilitation and about 0.7% needing replacement.

Over the seven-year planning period for this Element, an average of 44 units per year would need rehabilitation, while an average of three to four units per year would possibly need replacement. It should be understood that upon detailed inspection, some units thought to be candidates for rehabilitation will be found to be unfeasible to repair, and vice versa, so the numbers may change slightly.

Since a door-to-door survey has not been undertaken for Gridley's unincorporated surroundings, it is assumed that similar proportions of deteriorating (18% - 594 units) and dilapidated units (1.3% - 43 units) apply here as within the City.

According to the City's Public Works Department, an "Abatement Program" for dilapidated housing was carried out between 1969 and 1972, in which dilapidated units were informally selected and demolished by the City. The director of the program selected the units personally and no records were kept. Funds were insufficient to maintain the program and it was discontinued in 1972.

TABLE 21

AGE OF HOUSING: 1970

Years	State	Butte County	Gridley	Gridley, 1980*
0 - 10	31.3%	29.7%	11.4%	16%
10 - 20	29.1%	26.4%	18.5%	12%
20 - 30	15.9%	17.5%	17.8%	18%
30+	23.7%	26.2%	52.3%	54%

Source: Gridley Housing Element, 1974.

*Source: 1980 U.S. Census, STF 2

TABLE 22

UNITS LACKING COMPLETE PLUMBING FOR EXCLUSIVE USE

		1970			1980
		Percentage of			Percentage of
	<u>No.</u>	<u>Housing Stock</u>		<u>No.</u>	<u>Housing Stock</u>
Gridley City	29	2.2		14	0.8
Gridley CCD	---	---		21	0.6

Source: 1970, 1980 U.S. Census

TABLE 23

HOUSING CONDITION, GRIDLEY 1975

	<u>Responding Households</u>	<u>Households with no Response*</u>	<u>Total Number</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Sound Unit	796	398	1,167	86
Deteriorating Unit	112	58	170	13
Inadequate Construction	1	1	1	0.1
Under repair	2	1	2	0.2
Dilapidated Unit	<u>7</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>0.7</u>
Total Responding Household	891	461	1,352	100

Source: 1975 Butte County Special Census.

TABLE 24

CITY OF GRIDLEY - COUNTY
COMPARISON OF HOUSING CONDITION

<u>Condition</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Percentage City of Gridley</u>	<u>Gridley HSD</u>
Sound	93%	86%	86%
Deteriorating, etc.	6%	13%	13%
Dilapidated	1%	1%	1%

Source: 1975 Special Census, Butte County, Question No. 9

*461 out of 1,352, or 34% did not respond. It is assumed that these households can be proportionately distributed with the responses.

Overcrowding

One person per room is considered maximum acceptable crowding in census data gathering. Table 25 shows that Gridley, especially the unincorporated Gridley area, has a greater proportion of overcrowded houses than the County as a whole. The Gridley area's overcrowded units are also more crowded (6 persons per unit on the average than those of the County as a whole (5 persons per unit on the average). The area outside of Gridley's City Limits contain 1 1/2 times the number of overcrowded units of the area within the City's Limits. This may reflect large families and the combining of more than one family in a dwelling unit, both of which are common among the farmworker population.

Overcrowding among farmworkers is documented (unofficially by a March, 1982 conversation with Concilio Mexicano staff and by a 1982 interview with the Butte County Housing Authority, reporting as many as eight people residing in two-bedroom subsidized farmworker related units in the unincorporated area around Gridley.

: Updated information from the 1983 Community Development Survey shows a total of 158 overcrowded households within Gridley's City Limits, versus 104 in 1980. While the types of units (single-family house, apartment, duplex) being overcrowded are not known, the 1983 study indicates that about half of the overcrowded households (79 units) are Low and Very-Low Income renters. Another 39% (61 units) are Low and Very Low Income homeowners. The remaining 11% (18 units) are Moderate Income

homeowners and renters.

TABLE 25
OVERCROWDING
(Households)

<u>Persons/Room</u>	CCD		City		County		State
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1.00 or less	2,855	92.0%	1,418	93.0%	54,899	96.5%	93.0%
1.01 - 1.5	141	4.5	68	4.5	1,312	2.3	4.0
1.51 or more	<u>110</u>	<u>3.5</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>2.5</u>	<u>693</u>	<u>1.2</u>	<u>3.0</u>
Total Overcrowded Units	251	8.0	104	7.0	2,005	3.5	7.0
Total Occupied Units	3,106	100.0%	1,522	100.0%	56,904	100.0%	100.0%

Source: 1980 U.S. Census

ANALYSIS OF NEED

Need for housing is based on the difference between supply and demand; each of these factors has several components. "Supply" consists of existing units, while "Demand" is composed mainly of units required to accomodate population growth plus replacements for units lost through demolition (dilapidated units).

Over time, a given housing value bracket can be "supplied" by units from the next higher bracket deteriorating and declining in value. However, this effect would be neutralized by units lost to the next lower bracket through deterioration. The only bracket with a net gain of housing through this "trickle-down" process would be the "Very Low" value bracket, while the "High" value bracket would experience a net loss of units. This deterioration process has undoubtedly contributed to the low value of many Gridley homes, and will continue to do so as long as no rehabilitation efforts take place. However, the process takes place very slowly, and it would be impossible to say how many homes "trickle-down" into a lower bracket each year. Therefore the process is acknowledged and considered a factor in the need for rehabilitation programs, but is not quantitatively incorporated into the housing needs analysis.

In this section, housing needs are assessed for the Gridley Area and the City of Gridley according to the following need categories:

1. Affordability: need by income group

2. Habitability: need for rehabilitation or replacement
3. Overcrowding: units needed to relieve existing overcrowding
4. Special Needs: needs of certain population sub-groups (other than income groups)

For each need category, existing needs (as of 1984) and projected needs (1984 through 1989) will be distinguished.

A. Existing Need

Affordability

In order to ascertain how well Gridley's available housing stock (including vacant units) matches the economic needs of its population, housing values have been compared with household incomes City-wide in Table 26.

The household income profile found in the 1983 Community Development Survey (adjusted as explained under "Housing Income"), and new units built between 1980 and 1983, have been incorporated into Table 26, which compares numbers of households and numbers of existing housing units in each income category. The last column in Table 26 show the disparities that exist between the two. These disparities are the gaps (surpluses or shortages) between units and household which would exist if every household was paying approximately 25% of its income for housing.

The end results (column 6) are thus theoretical. For example, the housing stock contained 241 more housing units "affordable" in the Moderate Income range than households in that category. Actually, however, only 26 of these "extra" units were vacant. The remainder were filled by (a) some of the 37

households with "High" incomes who could not fund a home in their bracket, and (b) some of the 108 households in the "Very Low" income category who could not find a suitable unit in their bracket. Thus some households are underpaying for housing and some are overpaying, causing actual occupancy to depart from the theoretical income/value-matched brackets shown in Table 26. This information can be compared with that from the 1980 Census-based overpayment analysis (Table 27), indicating 416 Lower Income households overpaying for housing.

TABLE 26

ESTIMATED OCCUPANCY CONDITIONS IN GRIDLEY CITY, 1983

Based on 1,732* Total Housing Units												
Income (a) Category	Gross Monthly Income	1 Households by Income Category		2 Owner-Occupied Units (c)		3 Rental Units (d)		4 Vacant Units (g)		5 Sum of Units (2+3+4)		Differences (5-1)
		%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	
Very Low \$8,967	0-\$747	39%	632	4%	70	23% (e)	392	3%	62 (f)	30%	524	-108
						Up to \$18,300 Up to \$187/mo.						
Low \$747-1,198	\$747-1,198	21%	341	7%	129	12%	205	1%	21	20%	355	+14
						\$18,300-\$28,975 \$187-\$299/mo.						
Moderate \$14,347-\$21,521	\$1,196-1,793	16%	260	24%	417	3%	58	2%	26	29%	501	+241
						\$28,975-\$47,946 \$299-\$499/mo.						
High Over \$21,521	Over \$1,793	24%	389	20%	342	1%	9	1%	1	21%	352	-37
						Over \$47,946 Over \$499/mo.						
TOTALS		100%	1,622	55	958	39	664	6%	110	100%	1,732	+110

Source: 1983 Community Development Survey

- (b) Source: 1983 Community Development Survey, adjusted (see Table 13)
- (c) Source: 1980 U.S. Census, Gridley, Table 38, plus units built 1980-83. Actual home values not inflated from 1980 values.
- (d) Source: 1980 U.S. Census, Gridley, Table 43, plus units built 1980-83. Rents inflated using 1.22 factor.
- (e) Basis-Home Values: Gridley Bank of America financing plus possibility of non-conventional financing. Ratio of approximately 2:1, home value to income. Brackets inflated from 1980 dollar values by 1.22 multiplier.
- (f) Basis: 25% of household monthly income for rent. Brackets inflated from 1980 dollar values by 1.22 multiplier.
- (g) Corrected from sample of 105 units to include all 110 units in 1983 CDS.

Overpayment

Documentation of overpayment-number of families paying over 25% of their incomes for housing-is theoretically possible using the 1980 U.S. Census. Table 27 shows that as of 1980 in Gridley City, 416 Low and Very Low Income households paid over 25% of their incomes for housing. Approximately 28% of this number were homeowners, while 72% were renters. This information is based on 1980 Census data for income distribution for home value or gross rent which translate into monthly housing costs). Its accuracy is dependent upon the accuracy of the Census income and housing cost data, both of which are questionable (see discussions on Household Income and Home Value/Contract Rent). The number 416 is thus theoretical.

The 1983 Community Development Survey indicates that 302 Lower Income families are overpaying for housing. However, the percentage of households in the lower income brackets apparently rose between 1980 and 1983, suggesting that overpayment may be somewhat higher than the response would indicate. For the purposes of this Element, an average between the 1980 and 1983 overpayment figures is used, yielding approximately 350 Low and Very Low Income households overpaying for housing.

From this number, 90 households holding Section 8 rental assistance certificates were subtracted for 1983, since this assistance actually enables those households to pay under 25% of their incomes for housing. (These households were included in the 350 reported as overpaying.) The result was 260 overpaying

Lower Income Households. As of 1984, the number of overpaying households would again be estimated at 350, since the 90 Section 8-holders can be subtracted only once.

The conclusion concerning the nature of "Immediate Need" is not that hundreds of new affordable housing units need to be built to alleviate the overpayment situation indicated by Tables 26 and 27. This would only elevate the currently acceptable overall vacancy rate of 5.8%-assuming families chose to move. Rather, some means of making the existing, occupied housing units more affordable is indicated. It is also recognized that the local and nationwide economic conditions and unemployment responsible for this problem mean that other (non-housing) strategies such as new policies and programs for local economic stimulus may be called for.

Whether this same situation exists in the unincorporated area around Gridley is not known, since no 1983 survey was conducted there. However, since the overpayment problem within Gridley is a symptom of economic imbalances occurring both locally and nationwide, and since the Gridley area as a whole is one economic unit, it can be assumed that a similar situation exists in the unincorporated area. Incomes are somewhat higher in general in the unincorporated area, so the overpayment problem is very likely somewhat less serious there.

Availability of Vacant Units: Value (Affordability)

The 110 vacant units within the City in 1983 fell into the value distribution shown in Table 28. Although three-quarters of

these units fall into the two lowest value brackets, their size, location, rental status, or condition may not fit the needs of the many lower-income families overpaying for housing (Table 27). Several units had severe structural deficiencies. (Please see discussion below on condition of vacant housing as of 1980).

TABLE 27

OVERPAYMENT FOR HOUSING, 1980

Households in Low and Very Low
Income Categories Paying over
25 Percent of Incomes for Housing

LOWER INCOME HOUSEHOLDS (with incomes under 80% of Butte County Median Income \$14,700*)					% of All Households ^b		Number of Households, Corrected to	
0-\$4999		\$5000-\$9999	\$10,000-\$11,760	under \$11,760	Total	Households	(all income groups)	100% Sample ^c
No.	% ^a	No.	%	No.	%			
Owners	69	18.4	20	5.3	17	4.5	106	28.3
Renters	144	38.4	118	31.5	7	1.9	269	71.7
TOTAL	213	56.8	138	36.8	24	6.4	375	100
								26.7
								416

^a % of all Lower Income households (those households with incomes under \$11,760) who responded to this census question (total = 375).

^b Total respondents, all income groups - 1402

^c Percents in previous column x 1552, total households in Gridley in 1980.

*Note: \$14,700 is less than 2% different from the revised 1980 HUD median family income for Butte County.

Source: 1980 U.S. Census, STF 3 Tables 132, 139.

California Department of Housing and Community Development,
"Methodology for Calculating Lower-Income Overpayment"

TABLE 28

VALUE DISTRIBUTION OF VACANT UNITS-GRIDLEY, 1983

Value Bracket (<u>1983 Dollars</u>)	Corresponding Income Bracket*	Vacant Units	
		<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
0-\$18,300	Very Low	61	55
\$18,399-\$28,975	Low	21	19
\$28,975-\$47,946	Moderate	26	24
Over \$47,946	High	2	2

*Based on 25% of household income for housing and Gridley Bank of America financing plus possibility of nonconventional financing.

Note: Assumptions: a) Three lower brackets = rental units. Rents increased at same rates as incomes. b) Highest bracket = homeowner units. Values remained same as in 1980.

Vacancy Rates and Housing Availability

Experience in the housing industry indicates that reasonable or desirable vacancy rates are about 6% for rental units and 2% for homeowner units, with a 5% overall (Composite) vacancy rate. These "rules of thumb" guide assessment of housing availability. Vacancy rates by income groups are shown in Table 29.

TABLE 29

VACANCY RATES - GRIDLEY, 1983

	1	2	3	Vacancy Rate By	Weighted Vacancy
Income	Vacant	Occupied		Category	Rate
	^a	^b		^c	^d
<u>Category</u>	<u>Units</u>	<u>Units</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Category</u>	<u>Rate</u>
Very Low	61	462	523	11.0%	3.3%
Low	21	334	355	5.6%	1.1%
Moderate	26	475	501	5.0%	1.4%
High	<u>2</u>	<u>351</u>	<u>353</u>	0.3%	<u>0.1%</u>
Totals	110	1,622	1,732		5.8%
					(Composite Vacancy Rate)

a) Table 28

b) Table 26

c) 1,732 total units found in 1983 CDS

c) Column 1 divided by Column 3.

d) Vacancy rate by category x proportion of units in that category, e.g.,
 $3.3\% = 11\% \times 523/1,732$

The composite vacancy rates in Table 29 indicate the following availability of housing in 1983, assuming that all units (vacant and occupied) in the two lower brackets are rentals; in the "Moderate" bracket vacant units are rentals while occupied units are mostly rentals with some homeowner units; and all "High" bracket units are homeowner units.

TABLE 30

HOUSING AVAILABILITY, 1983

Income/Value <u>Category</u>	1983 Housing <u>Availability</u>
Very Low	Surplus
Low	Supply Matches Demand
Moderate	Slight Surplus
High	Shortage

Examination of the above vacancy rates for Gridley in 1983 reveals an interesting picture of housing choices made by Gridley residents. The fact that the overall (composite) vacancy rate is close to 5% indicates that the population is housed; however, the vacancy rates within income brackets indicates that some households may be living in units above their means, since many units lie vacant in the lowest value bracket while few units are available in the highest value bracket. (This overpayment for housing is demonstrated in Table 27).

Condition of Vacant Units

Correlation by address was used to determine the condition of the units found to be vacant in a 1980 Vacancy/Demand Study based on utility shutoffs by address. Condition, as reported in the 1983 Community Development Survey, was matched to each unit vacant in 1980. Results showed 76% of units with no major deficiencies and 24% with substantial structural or functional deficiencies. Thus, while some of the vacant units may not be affordable to Lower Income families, the majority are both affordable (Table 28) and habitable. (The assumption is made that units were in similar condition and relative cost bracket in 1983 as in 1980.) However, other attributes of the vacant housing (size, location, rental status, etc.), may not match the needs and preferences of overpaying households.

Habitability

Approximately 300 units presently need **rehabilitation** within the City Limits (see discussion on Housing Age and Condition

under "Housing Stock Characteristics"). Just under half of these homes are in need of major repair; the remainder need moderate levels of repair.

Approximately 24 units are dilapidated beyond feasible repair and need eventual replacement; this number of new (replacement) units has been incorporated into the numbers of new units needed to be built per year presented in the Housing Needs Summary (Table 42); they all fall into the "Very Low" income/value category and so should also be replaced into that category.

Overcrowding

The need for affordable larger units to relieve existing overcrowding (about 9 percent of the 1980 housing stock, or 158 units) can be addressed as projected needs for new housing are met through ongoing programs. Please see discussion on Overcrowding under "Projected Need".

Special Needs

Elderly Households

With approximately 20% of its population over 65 and a continuing trend towards a larger elderly population, the Gridley area has a significant demand for housing built with this age group in mind. This means the housing must be within walking distance of shopping community services and facilities such as parks, library and churches; it must be affordable and some must have handicapped accessible features. According to John Bowling of the Butte County Housing Authority, the housing needs of the

elderly in Gridley are being met abundantly by recent and on-going private and public projects.

Ethnic Minorities, Handicapped, Female-Headed Households

No locational or other needs for these groups distinct from other Low Income housing needs have been identified.

Please refer to the discussions under "Projected Need".

Large Families

Please refer to the discussion of need for larger units under "Overcrowding".

Emergency Shelter for the Homeless

Please refer to the discussion on Page 56.

B. Projected Needs (1984 through 1989)

Affordability

In this section, the number of units needed for the City of Gridley each year from 1984 through 1989 are presented as total units for the planning period (Table 32) and for each income group (Table 34). For the purposes of this Housing Element, "need" is that total amount of housing which, if built within the planning period, would keep Gridley's housing vacancy rate near an optimum level (about 5 to 6%) and provide housing to each income level in accordance with its proportion of the population.

Methodology: Regional Allocation Plan

In Table 32, the 1984 through 1989 projected increase in households (127 new households), calculated in Table 3, was added to the 1984 housing stock. To this were added the units needing replacement. The resulting totals were then distributed over the

five years (using an exponential function) to give number of new units needed per year to accomodate natural increase and replace dilapidated units. Adding 127 new units over five years represents a 1.4% annual increase in housing stock.

It should be pointed out here that the projected needs in this Element are based on a continuation of the 1.27% annual growth rate experienced in Gridley from 1980 to 1984 (Source: U.S. Census and State DOF estimates for 1984). These Census-based projections indicated 1,745 households in Gridley in 1989. This differs from the projections done by the Butte County Association of Governments (BCAG) in its draft Regional Allocation Plan, which indicate 1,889 households (for 1989) (see Appendix D). The BCAG projections would result in an annual household increment of about 50, compared to about 30 using historic growth rates for projection (see Tables 32 and 33).

Since the County as a whole was determined to have 44% Lower Income households in 1983, Gridley is considered "impacted" (having more than its share of Lower Income households) with 60% Lower Income households in 1983. For this reason, BCAG has allocated less than the present population for Gridley's future responsibility.

In its Regional Housing Needs Plan, BCAG applies the proportions allocated to the various income groupings (Table 31) to the numbers of households projected for the years 1984 through 1990. The projected household numbers are based on State Department of Finance population and household estimates for

Butte County and on the assumption that Gridley will grow at the same rate as Butte County over the next five-year period. BCAG's conclusions are that by 1990 Gridley would have "target" responsibility for 545 Very Low Income households and 311 Low Income households (1889 households total).

For the purpose of projecting future housing need, this Element adopts BCAG's income group proportions. These proportions (Table 31) result in Gridley's "target" responsibility, recommended by BCAG, for housing affordable to Low Income households amounting to 44% of its projected number of households.

TABLE 31

BCAG'S INCOME GROUP PROPORTIONS

Very Low Income	28%
Low Income	16%
Moderate	20%
High Income	36%

However, this Element applies these percentages to projected household numbers projected by the Census-based methodology, rather than BCAG's methodology, for the follow reasons:

1. The BCAG methodology is based on maintaining relationship of the size of Gridley's population to the size of Butte County's population. This, however, assumes that the two will have the same rate of growth between 1984 and 1989. Historical and present statistics show that Gridley has always grown at a rate close to half of Butte County's (see Tables 1 and 1-A). The methodology used for this Element is based on maintaining the relationship of the rates of population growth of Gridley and Butte County.

2. Census-based growth trends for Gridley (1970-1980: 1.20% per year; 1980-84: 1.27% per year) contradict the growth rate of over 3% per year indicated in BCAG's work. Don Crow of the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) has indicated that the historic growth rate is a valid basis for population projections in the absence of any community changes which would alter the growth rate. Conversations with Evelene Payne, Jean Simmons and David McEntyre revealed that no economic or demographic forces are presently at work or foreseeable in Gridley to warrant a departure from the historic growth rate.
3. Gary Sannar of the Butte County Housing Authority (BCHA) has indicated that Gridley is not seen as a "growth area" for development of Low Income housing, compared with the rest of Butte County. In fact, as of February, 1984, the BCHA has been advertising outside Butte County to fill its Farm Labor housing (letter, Gridley Herald 2/16/84).
4. A depressed or "stagnating" nature of economic conditions within Gridley indicated by a large percentage of store closures in the downtown commercial district, reflect imbalances unique to the local Gridley economy. These conditions may call for some stimulating economic development or other measures, but do not warrant the assumption of a substantially increased population growth rate within the next five years. A letter drafted by planning consultant Ms. Barbara Castro on behalf of the City of Gridley to BCAG staff requested that their estimates of future housing goals be revised to reflect Gridley's actual historic annual population growth rate. (See letter in Appendix D. Butte County Regional Allocation Plan Projections).

TABLE 32

UNITS NEEDED TO BE BUILT PER YEAR, 1984 THOUGH 1989 - GRIDLEY CITY

<u>Year</u>	Base Housing <u>Stock</u> a	<u>New</u> <u>Units</u>	Replacement <u>Units*</u>	New Units <u>Needed Per Year</u>
1984	1,763			
1985	1,782	19	4	23
1986	1,801	19	5	24
1987	1,820	19	5	24
1988	1,839	19	5	24
1989	1,860	21	5	26
		---	---	---
TOTALS		97	24	121
(Units added over five years)				

Resulting 1989 vacancy rate: 5.8% (110 vacant units assumed constant)

*New units to replace dilapidated units are added to new units needed to accommodate population growth; these replacement units would not alter the vacancy rate or overall growth of housing, assuming removal of old units.

a

Total housing stock in 1984: 1.732 (includes 110 vacant units)
+ 31 units built in 1983-84 = 1.763.

TABLE 33

COMPARISON TABLE: NEW UNITS TO ACCOMMODATE PROJECTED
GRIDLEY HOUSEHOLD INCREASE BASED ON BUTTE COUNTY'S
POPULATION PROJECTION*

<u>Year</u>	Base Housing <u>Stock</u>	New <u>Units</u>
1984	1,763	
1985	1,812	49
1986	1,863	51
1987	1,915	52
1988	1,968	53
1989	2,023	55
TOTAL		-----
(Units added over 5 years)		260

*Using a compounding multiplier of 1.0279 (or 2.79 percent per year) derived exponentially from a projected increase of 260 households (a 14.7% increase in housing stock) between 1984 and 1989, according to BCAG's figures in Appendix A of the 1984 Revised Butte County Housing Element. (See Appendix D of this Element).

In Table 31, the proportions of new units allocated to the various income groups are adopted from the BCAG Regional Allocation Plan. Using these proportions (rather than, for example, Gridley's actual 1983 income distribution) for allocating future housing serves to equalize or offset the effect of recent "impaction" (see discussion above under "Regional Allocation Plan"). It should be noted that the proportion of new housing allocated to the two lowest income groups adds up to 44%, which matches Gridley's Regional Share of non-market-rate housing

according to the 1984 BCAG Plan.

Projected Need - Theoretical and Actual

Table 34 presents the theoretical need, by income group, for housing to accommodate Gridley's population growth (at a rate of 1.27% per year) and resulting increase of 127 households over the period 1984-89. The percentages from Table 31 for each income group were applied to the yearly need shown in Table 32.

TABLE 34

THEORETICAL PROJECTED HOUSING NEED BY INCOME GROUP, 1984 - 1989
(Housing Units)

	<u>Very Low</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>Moderate</u>	<u>Above Moderate</u>	<u>Total</u>
Theoretical Need 1984-1989					
84-85	7	4	5	9	25
85-86	7	4	5	9	25
86-87	7	4	5	9	25
87-88	7	4	5	9	25
88-89	<u>8</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>27</u>
Total	36	20	25	46	127

The actual need for housing in the 1984-89 planning period must take into account the residual need for housing "leftover" from the period 1980-84. This need, reflecting building actually occurring in those years, is shown in Table 35.

TABLE 35

RESIDUAL HOUSING NEED AS OF 1984

(Housing Units)

^a

A. Theoretical Need 1980-84

	<u>Very Low</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>Moderate</u>	<u>Above Moderate</u>	<u>Total</u>
1980-81	5	6	8	6	25
81-82	5	6	8	6	25
82-83	5	7	8	6	26
83-84	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>29</u>
Total	21	26	33	25	105

^b

B. Units Actually Built 1980-84

1980-83	42	22	30	10	104
83-84	<u>0</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>31</u>
TOTAL	42	52	30	11	135

Residual Needs as of 1984	-21	-26	+ 3	+14	- 30
---------------------------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	------

^a

Source: Tables 31 and 33 of previous Housing Element (H.E.)

^bSource: 1980-83: pages 52, 54 of previous H.E.
1983-84: Appendix C

When the residual need shown in Table 35 is added to the theoretical need (from Table 34), the result is a yearly projected need for housing, 1984-89, based upon current assumptions of household growth rate (1.52% annually) and taking most recent building into account (see Table 36).

TABLE 36
PROJECTED HOUSING NEED BY INCOME GROUP, 1984-89^a
UPDATED AS OF 1984
(Housing Units)

	<u>Very Low</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>Moderate</u>	<u>Above Moderate</u>	<u>Total</u>
1984-85	0	0	8	23	31
85-86	0	0	5	9	14
86-87	0	0	5	9	14
87-88	7	0	5	9	21
88-89	<u>8</u>	<u>-6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>17</u>
Total	15	-6	28	60	97

a
Source: Table 34 plus residual need in Table 35

Habitability

The number of units needing replacement each year due to dilapidated condition is presented in Table 32. These are estimates based on data from the 1983 Community Development Survey; it is assumed that the 24 units found needing replacement in 1983 will stay constant, since none have been removed or replaced and no more units are expected to become dilapidated in the next five years.

Overcrowding

The units recommended to be built per year (Table 32) to accommodate population growth and reduction in household size as well as to replace demolished units should be sufficient to relieve the conditions of overcrowding indicated in the section

on Housing Stock Overcrowding provided that emphasis is placed on larger units while preserving affordability. If approximately 25% of all units built or rehabilitated were in the 3- to 5-bedroom range, the need for larger units to serve both large families and other overcrowded households could be substantially met. This would include using grant funds to assist in adding rooms onto smaller houses or apartments. (Note: 25% is the approximate proportion of overcrowded households to all households with some form of unmet housing needs).

It can also be pointed out here that among farmworker families, more than one person per room (the usual standard for overcrowding) is more generally acceptable than among dominant culture families (Butte County Housing Authority). Thus, even if additional units were built to accommodate the people in crowded units, it is likely that a certain portion of these new units would, themselves, become "overcrowded" as large extended families move in over time. In recognition that some of the overcrowding is voluntary, it is anticipated that any persisting real need (involuntary overcrowding) involved can be accommodated by the provision of housing as suggested in Table 32.

Special Needs

Elderly Households

Federal assistance for elderly housing has not been the object of budget cuts as have many assistance programs, so the prospect of continuing to meet the needs of about 10 additional

elderly people per year* is good.

Ethnic Minorities

Because no concentrations of minorities apparently exist in the Gridley area, it is assumed that the housing needs of the minority population can be met through the market for market-rate households and through the provisions in this Element for "low" and "Very Low" income housing for non-market-rate households.

The Butte County Housing Authority does have a bilingual staff to assist Spanish-speaking families with questions or problems relating to housing needs.

Handicapped

A survey of the handicapped population of and the handicapped-accessibility of the housing in the Gridley area is needed to indicate the extent of need for housing specifically designed with handicapped-accessible features. The 1980 Census indicates about 200 persons with needs for adaptations, but to what degree this need is already met in existing housing (including elderly units) is not known. It can be assumed that some need is unmet needing a mechanism for being addressed.

Female-Headed Households

Although one-fifth of the Gridley area's households are female-headed, no information is available which indicates what proportion of those households are presently lacking adequate

*19% of Gridley's 1984 Household Population of 4,096 = 778
778 x 1.27% = 788. Annual addition of people over 65 = 10.

housing. If the female headed households in financial need are assumed to be included within the "Low" or "Very Low" income brackets, and if the housing built for these non-market rate households is adequate in terms of proximity to schools, parks and community services such as day care centers, then it can be assumed that the housing needs of female-headed households will be met.

Emergency Shelter for the Homeless

Gridley Emergency Relief Service (GERS) provides temporary lodging in a local motel for up to one week for persons and families in need of emergency housing.

Bernice Kossow, charter member of GERS, reports that approximately 30 persons/families are aided annually through this organization. The majority of recipients require only one or two nights lodging. In addition to the temporary lodging services, GERS provides food and clothing. GERS has been in existence for eleven years and is funded by local citizens and merchants.

The Gridley Chapter of the Salvation Army also provides a shelter program by which they will pay one month's rent for recipients who have a lease agreement with a landlord. This shelter program has been in existence for three years and five families have been aided through this organization. According to Mrs. Kossow, Chapter Chairman, the Salvation Army has been active in Gridley for twenty years.

CONSTRAINTS ON HOUSING AVAILABILITY

Market Constraints

The private housing market, in which the housing industry must make a profit but the consumers will not buy if the costs exceed a certain percentage of their incomes, contains many built-in constraints to availability of adequate housing for all income and other groups. Housing becomes unavailable when costs of all components together (land, materials, labor and site improvement) are so high that in order to make a profit the developer must price homes out of the reach of most consumers; and when interest rates are so high that monthly payments exceed a viable proportion of the consumer's income.

Cost Factors

In the Gridley area, the following cost factors combine to yield a "slow" housing market, in which few new homes are being built and sale of existing homes is difficult. Table 38 indicates the low number of new housing starts in Gridley over the past several years. Planning Department staff feels that the trend for home building is to fluctuate around a low number of units per year (in the range of 5-12), punctuated with brief peaks only when subsidized housing projects were built.

TABLE 37

CITY OF GRIDLEY BUILDING PERMITS ISSUED PER YEAR

1970 - 1984

	<u>Year</u>	<u>Number of New Housing Starts</u>
1970	1	
1971	29 (includes 24 BCHA Senior Citizen Units)	
1972	18 (FmHA Loan homes)	
1973	9	
1974	7	
1975	8	
1976	6	
1977	105 (Includes 75 FmHA Loan homes and 24 BCHA units)	
1978	12	
1979	2	
1980	54 (Includes 46 Senior Citizens' apartments)	
1981	3 (Includes 2 FmHA Loan homes)	
1982	47 (Includes 10 Senior Citizens' apartments and 37 FmHA loan homes)	
1983	30	
1984	3 (Includes 2 FmHA loan homes)	
1985	2	

Source: City of Gridley Department of Public Works. Homes built 1983-84 were following a moratorium lasting over one year. See also Appendix C.

According to Ruth King, a long-time Gridley realtor, the only homes being built in Gridley currently are larger homes; two-bedrooms or moderate-sized to small homes are not profitable enough. Prices asked for new three-bedroom homes are about \$100,000; this agrees closely with the average price of a new home for Butte county. Table 38 shows the latest (1981) home price survey from the Construction Industry Research Board (CIRB). Table 39 shows the breakdown of costs for 1970, 1975, 1976 and 1980 for a typical California 1,600 square foot home in suburban growth area. CIRB Director, Ben Bardolado, points out that the only factor which would be substantially different (lower) in Gridley would be land costs. All other costs work out to be fairly uniform.

TABLE 38

1981 HOME PRICE SURVEY

<u>Location</u>	<u>Average New Home Sales Price</u>	<u>Median New Home Sales Price</u>	<u>Average Living Area (Square Foot)</u>	<u>Average Number Bedrooms</u>	<u>Average Price Per Sq. Foot</u>
State	\$ 120,500	\$105,300	1,610	3.0	\$74.85
Butte Co.	\$ 90,282	\$ 87,500	1,601	3.2	\$56.40
Sutter Co. (for comparison)	\$ 83,890	\$ 81,790	1,688	3.2	\$49.70

Source: Construction Industry Research Board

TABLE 39

CHANGES IN SHARE OF MAJOR COST COMPONENTS FOR A TYPICAL SINGLE FAMILY HOME
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Cost Component	1970		1975		1976		1980		Percent Change 1975-1980	Percent Change 1970-1980
	Cost	Percent Distribut.	Cost	Percent Distribut.	Cost	Percent Distribut.	Cost	Percent Distribut.		
Construction										
Labor	\$6,500	20.9%	\$9,580	19.0%	\$11,020	18.7%	\$14,850	15.5%	126%	55.0%
Materials	11,020	35.1%	15,620	31.0%	17,980	30.4%	25,920	27.0%	135%	65.9%
	17,580	56.0%	25,200	50.0%	29,000	49.1%	40,770	42.5%	132%	61.8%
Improved Land	\$ 6,600	21.0%	12,450	24.7%	14,800	25.0%	26,700	27.8%	304%	114.5%
Financing	2,040	6.5%	4,450	9.0%	5,000	8.5%	11,530	12.0%	465%	154.0%
Overhead and										
Profit	3,770	12.0%	5,770	11.5%	7,400	12.5%	12,200	12.7%	224%	111.4%
Other	1,410	4.5%	2,420	4.8%	2,900	4.9%	4,800	5.0%	240%	98.3%
	\$ 31,400	100.0%	\$50,400	100.0%	\$59,100	100.0%	\$96,000	100.0%	206%	90.5%

Source: Construction Industry Research Board

Land Cost

In Gridley, as in most rural areas, **raw** land costs about 10% of the total home price. This is the traditional proportion and is still true in rural areas although no longer true in urban and urbanizing areas.

The price of an improved lot in the City of Gridley is typically listed at \$20,000 but would actually sell for about \$11,000 (Ruth King Realty, Gridley). This price is approximately what was paid for the only three lots sold in Gridley in 1982 (as of June); they were sold as part of a FmHA low-income package to private contractors. According to King, improved lots will not sell in Gridley for the price asked.

Site Development Costs

According to the CIRB improved land generally is double the price of raw land. As discussed under land costs, an improved lot (with sewers, sidewalks, drainage, etc.) costs too much for most people in Gridley to afford. Lots will only sell now for what would be the current price for raw land. Table 39 shows that statewide the price of improved land has more than doubled since 1975; much of this increase is due to the inflating costs of on- and off-site development: grading, sewer, drainage, sidewalks, roads. To a degree, local governments do have control over how much of these improvements' costs must be borne by the developer. In Gridley this is a minimum feasible share and is

currently under further study (see Government Constraints sections).

Construction Costs (Labor, Materials)

Materials and labor costs for new housing in Gridley would be equivalent to those for the State as a whole, according to CIRB Director, Ben Bardolado. 1980 figures for these cost factors for a 1,600 square foot, three-bedroom home would be \$14,850 and \$25,920 respectively, 15% and 27% of the sales price of \$96,000 (see Table 39).

Interest Rates

At present, interest rates on most home mortgages are hovering around 13%; this applies to Gridley as well through conventional (bank) financing. Under this condition, monthly payments on a new home exceed a comfortable percentage of incomes; this condition extends into income brackets usually considered "market-rate". The result is that on the open market people are not buying new homes. Table 37 indicates that large subdivisions since 1970 have been subsidized (non-market-rate) housing. As seen in Table 39, the five-fold increase in financing costs since 1970 (two to three-fold since 1975) has played the largest part in the tripling of home prices. According to the Gridley Public Works Department, in Gridley the high interest rate, coupled with the high cost of even small lots, are the main factors constraining the building, buying and selling of homes.

Type of Units Available

One result of the operation of the housing market is the range of home types available in the community: owned or rented, single- or multi-family, mobile or conventional homes.

Owned vs. Rental Units

The occupied Gridley housing stock consists of about 60% owner-occupied, 40% renter-occupied. The vacant units are mostly in the lower value brackets (see Table 28), of which nearly three-quarters are rental units (Table 26). Almost all the housing built recently in the Gridley area (excluding the Senior Citizen apartments and the farm labor units on the Gridley Highway) has been for home-owners, whether FmHA assisted or unassisted. From these indications it is clear that in Gridley approximately equal proportion of rental and owned housing are potentially available, although at any one time more for-rent units than for-sale units may be vacant.

Single- vs. Multi-Family

: With the exception of 56 apartments for the elderly recently approved, most housing units built recently in Gridley are single-family detached units. As seen in Table 7, almost 90% of the Gridley area housing stock is single-family (including mobile homes). Relatively few multi-family units are even potentially available.

Mobile Homes

At present only 163 or 5% of the Gridley area housing stock consists of mobile homes; of these, only 11 are within the City

Limits in a trailer park. The City does have a mobile home ordinance providing for mobile homes in residential areas. However, strong opposition exists in the area to siting mobile homes on residential streets, even if they meet all standards imposed by the city. Mobile homes are not at present a preferred type of housing in Gridley, even though allowed by State law if placed on a foundation and provided for by City ordinance.

Governmental Constraints

Local government does not have control over most of the cost factors discussed as "market constraints" to housing availability. Factors such as high interest rates, financing costs and inflated labor or materials costs are products of nationwide economic conditions. One large component of the sale price costs factors, the price of the land improvements, is under local government control. Table 39 shows that, next to financing, improved land costs have caused the greatest increase in typical California home prices. This contribution to high home costs and other constraints on the housing market controlled by the Gridley City Government are discussed in this section.

Land Availability

A land availability analysis was performed in mid-1983 for the purposes of determining if sufficient land exists in the City to accommodate the housing needs identified in this Housing Element. This analysis was based upon an early 1983 inventory of all existing land uses (in map form) and on a recently revised map of the City's zoning.

Three categories of land were reviewed for residential expansion potential within the Housing Element planning period of 5 years:

1. Vacant land within City Limits zoned for residential use;
2. Underutilized (partially vacant) land within City Limits zoned for residential use; and
3. Vacant land within the City's Sphere of Influence.

"Underutilized" land consists of lots of an acre or more in size which contain only one small structure, parking lot, or are otherwise primarily unused. This type of land makes up a very small percentage of Gridley's vacant land (see Table 40).

To cover the probability that a certain percent of vacant ("available") land will be unfeasible to develop within the next 5 years, it is the City's policy to provide a cushion of 100 percent more than the necessary land in its Zoning Map.

Table 40 shows that Gridley has enough vacant land (within the City's Sphere of Influence) to provide for a total of approximately 500 new units, under the 1983 zoning map.

Table 41 compares projected (1989) housing needs and land availability. The table takes into account the need for a "cushion" of more than enough land to provide maneuvering room for the market to operate. (This is so that enough land will still be available to give people a choice of where to build even if a substantial number of property owners do not decide to develop or subdivide their land in that time period). Under the 1983 zoning, more than enough land is available to fill the need

for single-family, duplex and multi-family housing, assuming infrastructure is also available to adequate levels.

An analysis of Gridley's vacant lands as to availability of adequate infrastructure (water, sewer, drainage, roads) would indicate which parcels are truly available for various housing types within the planning period 1984 - 1989. (See "Availability of Infrastructure" below.)

Availability of Infrastructure

An analysis of Gridley's vacant lands in relation to infrastructure availability and a review of approved housing projects yet to be constructed would indicate that housing needs for the five year planning period can be met. See Table 41A.

There are 24 R-1 (single-family residential) parcels ranging in size from 4180 square feet to 9440 square feet currently available for development. Six (6) R-S (residential-Suburban) parcels ranging in size from 10.450 square feet to 12.630 square feet are also available for single-family housing. These sites have water and sewer facilities available (only lateral extension is necessary for service) and storm drain facilities are existing. Sidewalk and curb will be required on the majority of these parcels.

Two acres of R-3 property (multi-family residential) is currently available with adequate infrastructure. A maximum of 24 units (12 DU per acre) could be constructed on these properties.

A general plan amendment and rezone to allow the

construction of 45 self-help single-family homes (low and moderate income households) was approved by the City in June, 1985. In addition, a 42-unit apartment complex financed through the FMHA loan program was approved in June, 1984.

Within the five year planning period of this housing update (1984-89) there is the possibility of an additional 35 acres of property zoned R-1 to be developed. Two sites (19 and 16 acres) located in the northeastern portion of the City have been included in a benefit area slated for major infrastructure improvements. A community development grant was awarded to the City in October, 1985. Major improvements to the existing drainage facilities and extension of city water and sewer services will greatly enhance the possibility of residential subdivision of these properties within the planning period.

TABLE 40

SUMMARY OF LAND AVAILABILITY ANALYSIS:

ADDITIONAL UNITS POSSIBLE IN GRIDLEY,* 1982-1987

		RESIDENTIAL DENSITY (1983 Zoning)				
LAND TYPE	(max. units per acre)	S-R (3)	R-1 (4)	R-2 (8)	R-3 (12)	TOTAL

Within City Limits						
Vacant and underutilized Land**						
	Acres	55.0	50.2	5.7	6.64	117.54
	Units	165	200	45	79	489
Outside City Limits						
Vacant Land						
	Acres	3.5	0	0	0	3.5
	Units	10	0	0	0	10
TOTAL	Acres	58.5	50.2	5.7	6.64	121.0
	Units	175	200	45	79	499

* All land analyzed is within Gridley's Primary Sphere of Influence

** Underutilized land accounts for 5 acres under S-R zoning and 0.5 acres under R-1 zoning. This represents 4.5% of all available residential land and could support a maximum of 17 dwelling units.

TABLE 41

ADDITIONAL HOUSING AND NEED FOR ADDITIONAL
LAND - GRIDLEY CITY, 1984-1989

Corresponding Zones:	Single-Family (S-R, R-1)	Duplex and Multi-Family (R-2, R-3)	Total
-----	-----	-----	-----
Needed units identified in Table 42*	85	36	121
Subtracted Replacement Units	12	12	24
Net New Units Needed	73	24	97
Units to be provided for (net need plus 100% cushion)	146	48	194
Units accommodated by available City land under 1983 Zoning	435	130	565
Units needing additional land under 1983 Zoning	0	0	0

*A 75% single-family - 25% duplex/multiple-family housing mix is applied to need for City of Gridley in Table 42. Replacement units are arbitrarily distributed 50% to each type of unit.

TABLE 41A

ADEQUATE SITES
IN RELATION TO HOUSING NEED

1984 - 1989

Corresponding Zones:	Single-Family (S-R, R-1)	Duplex and Multi-Family (R-2, R-3)	Total
New Units Needed (Table 41)	73	24	97
Total number of units accommodated by avail- able sites determined to have adequate infra- structure	75	66	141
Number of units that could be built on vacant, adequate sites	30	24	54
Number of units to be built for approved housing projects (1984-1985)	45	42	87

Development Impact Fees for Off-Site Improvements

Until the present time, Gridley has made a practice of requesting some fees from developers to cover partial capital expenditures costs. Appendix E details the fees currently required. These fees have not been for large percentages of total costs and have not been requested for all types of improvements. These fees have not been a major cost factor in home prices and would not by themselves cause homes to be unreasonably high priced. However, with review of capital facilities needs, this situation could change.

At present, Gridley is considering the formulation of a more systematic development impact fee schedule. The City's intent is to charge the developer a fair share of the cost of capital expenditures for water, sewer, drainage, parks and schools.¹ (Police services costs are covered by property tax and fire protection capacity is sufficient for double the present population with minor staff and equipment augmentation; user fees are sufficient at present to cover electrical utilities costs.)

The intent of the fee schedule would be to prevent fiscal imbalances for the City while not overburdening any one developer unfairly. The City's intent is to make each new residential development "pay its way". Developers can be expected to pass the cost on to the consumer, but since homes will not sell for

¹ Gridley is studying the fee question as a whole although the School District would actually collect fees for schools.

prices above those set by the operation of the market, developers would attempt to preserve their necessary profit margin by

(a) paying less for the raw land, driving local land prices down, and

(b) going elsewhere to develop housing.

Each requirement or standard will add an incremental cost to the development of housing. Although the standards are minimal compared to other cities, the Gridley housing market is so poor that the cumulative effect of meeting all City standards for infrastructure provision could render some projects infeasible.

Gridley sees the standards as minimal and is not inclined to lower them to make projects feasible. A reduction in standards would make resulting projects a potential liability; they would be less safe, more prone to rapid deterioration, and less aesthetically appealing. Besides lowering their standards, Gridley's other choices are:

(1) Accepting housing subsidized to meet the fees and standards; and/or

(2) Stimulate the local market with an economic development program.

Whether Gridley's development standards and fees will make any given housing project infeasible can only accurately be determined when project costs are available. This determination

2

OPR, 1982. Paying the Piper: New Ways to Pay for Public Infrastructure in California.

will rely on a combination of cost projections worked up by the developer's engineer and information available in Gridley's Public Facilities Element to be completed later in 1984.

The City will work within the framework of acceptable development standards to keep housing costs at a minimum.

On-Site Improvements

Developers have been required to provide the traditional site improvements (e.g., curbs, gutter and sidewalk) required for minimal safety and amenity in urban residential areas. These requirements, would not be subject to elimination, and would not by themselves constrain housing availability. They could, however, contribute to a constraint by reducing developers' profit margins as discussed above. The dollar amounts of fees for on-site improvements are included in Appendix E.

Permit Processing

Building permits in Gridley are processed within the limits set by AB 884 on processing times. This factor is not a constraint, as in some localities where processing delays building, adding inflated costs accumulated during the delay to the home sale price.

Fees other than development impact fees imposed on developers are the standard fees for plan checking, hearing fees, inspection and environmental review. These fees combined are not a significant percentage of the final home sales price, and are usually considered part of the costs of land improvement. The dollar amounts of these various processing fees are included in

Appendix E.

Building Codes and Enforcement

Gridley imposes no building codes over and above the Uniform Building Code. The Code is enforced insofar as flagrant violations which come to the City's attention are pursued and subject to abatement procedures including possible demolition. However, no systematic abatement program is currently in effect. In general, no unusual building codes or unfairly strict enforcement act as a limitation on building homes in Gridley.

City Housing and Growth Management Policies

In seeking to develop a balanced growth policy, the City of Gridley prefers that housing be provided by local builders for the purposes of serving locally-generated need. As a corollary, the City does not encourage developers from out of the area to build units in Gridley for the purpose of profit only (i.e. where need for new units does not exist), which may be superfluous and result in new residents in-migrating from other regions to occupy the housing. By maintaining its historical growth rates and preventing growth beyond the town's service systems' capacities to absorb new demands, Gridley hopes to preserve its character as a small town based on local agriculture. Thus the City intends to constrain new housing as needed to keep population growth rates within desired limits.

Use of Federal and State Programs

The City has not subscribed directly to any Federal or State housing assistance programs. However, other agencies such as the Butte County Housing Authority (BCHA), Chico Housing Improvement Program (CHIP) and private contractors have built federally-assisted housing in Gridley. The City and BCHA have a "Cooperation Agreement" in which Gridley facilitates the agency's role as builder of Low Income housing by tax waivers, and BCHA agrees to pay the City a PILOT payment (Payment in Lieu of Taxes) based on the income BCHA receives from use of its programs. Housing for the elderly has been built by private contractors under both HUD Section 202 building/rent assistance and Section 8 rent subsidy assistance. Farmworker housing has also been provided by BCHA with Federal (HUD Section 8, FmHA) assistance. To the extent that certain needs have not been fully met by either the private market or other agencies, this indirect participation in public housing assistance could be considered a constraint to provision of a full range of housing needs. These needs include middle income mortgage assistance, lower income rental, mortgage and home improvement assistance, and assistance in rehabilitation of older homes. BCHA is, however, set up to handle these needs and has ample programs and funds available. Gridley's role is primarily to refer families needing housing assistance to BCHA.

Although BCHA currently has more than adequate resources to meet Low Income housing needs in Gridley (Gary Sannar, BCHA),

many Federal housing assistance programs (e.g., HUD Section 8, some FmHA functions) may face reduced funding or virtual elimination. This would be a severe constraint to meeting many housing needs unless ways are found which depend neither on the open market nor on government assistance. The Housing Program discussion will consider ways other than public assistance to assure that Gridley can provide for the full range of housing needs, including its "fair share" obligation.

Availability of Infrastructure

Even if land is available and other conditions are not constraining, housing production rates can be reduced or even come to a halt if the community facilities necessary to serve the new dwellings for some reason cannot be supplied without excessive expense or cannot be supplied at all. This applies to water supply, electric power, sewer systems, roads, and drainage systems, schools and other necessary municipal services.

In Gridley, regulatory policies are designed to ensure that new developments pay their fair share of the costs of increasing infrastructure capacity to serve the new units being created. Even where excess capacity exists, City development philosophy dictates that new projects must "buy in" to use a share of the excess capacity that was created previously with taxpayers' funds or by private developers and dedicated to the City for ongoing maintenance. In this way, the City hopes to generate funds for infrastructure expansion commensurate with the need, so the capital facilities needed to serve new dwelling units can be

built at the time the need arises without unfair future cost burdens falling on any particular developer or on the taxpaying public.

Provisions of some of the infrastructure components is fairly straightforward and can be accomplished in the course of project review and approval. Roads, water supply and distribution lines, and electrical facilities are examples of public facilities that can be supplied for reasonably predictable costs, the costs being fairly uniform throughout the City. New development projects are expected to pay all capital costs required to serve the new development, and these costs are either spelled out in City ordinances or added as conditions of project approval.

Police and fire protection (except fire hydrant provision which is a developer's responsibility) have in the past been provided by the City on the theory that added revenues from the project (property tax, sales tax, etc.) will cover costs. The City intends to undertake cost/revenue studies in connection with its Public Facilities Element to be prepared in 1984 to examine this question, and the outcome of these studies is expected to influence the direction of future policy.

Availability of electrical power can be considered a constraining influence, not because insufficient power is available, but because the marginal cost of exceeding the City's power quota would push electrical rates to a level unacceptable to Gridley residents. As much power as would be needed under the

most rapid growth scenario imaginable can be purchased, but the community would prefer to keep rates at their present comparatively low level. Accordingly, growth limitation to avoid the need to purchase expensive power is an avenue attractive to the City, as are implementation of energy conservation measures and the development of new relatively inexpensive power sources.

Three infrastructure components can legitimately be termed constraints to development at this time because uncertainties related to costs of providing the necessary capital improvements, which vary dramatically from one section of the City to another. Of specific concern are: (1) drainage , and (2) sewage disposal.

Drainage

Because the terrain is so flat, many areas in and around Gridley have poor drainage. Although Gridley has adopted a Master Drainage Facilities Plan, the mechanism to handle drainage in some areas remains insufficient to meet all of the long-term need. Also, the City has not followed the plan in some past project approvals, having granted concessions to developers to keep their development costs low which will result in future projects shouldering a heavier cost burden to provide adequate drainage facilities to serve their projects. Until a complete assessment of the total drainage needs of the City is undertaken and a mechanism developed to equitably distribute costs of necessary facilities, many areas remain effectively unavailable for siting homes. Drainage can be provided to all parts of the City, but in some areas the costs are high enough to make

development projects financially unfeasible. Where costs are reasonable and development would be feasible, the City is reluctant to approve development projects until the entire Citywide need has been established and an equitable distribution of costs has been apportioned to each developable parcel.

Sewage Disposal

The sewage treatment plant is the limiting factor in Gridley's sewage disposal system; its design capacity of 1.05 MGD is theoretically adequate to handle a realistic 20-year flow projection of 1.016 MGD. This projection includes 0.11 MGD allocated to the Butte County migrant labor camp. Present peak storm inflows of one MGD exceed the plant's design capacity. The plant can handle the projected flows only if the current inflow/infiltration problem is substantially reduced. The City Engineer is optimistic that the plant's capacity will be adequate because (1) the inflow/infiltration problem has a reasonable chance of being solved; (2) the plant is conservatively designed for 100 gal/day per dwelling unit of residential wastewater production whereas about 70 gal/day is more accurate; and (3) the plant is already handling about 2 MGD during peak storm periods without problems. While optimism is appropriate, a solution to the excessive flows during winter storms has so far been an elusive goal. Efforts are continuing, but until the solution is achieved, the City does not know how much capacity is available and is reluctant to accept additional projects on the system.

One other infrastructure component which is not presently a

constraint to development but which has been requested for review by local school officials is the question of future school capacities and the ability of school districts to finance expansion when such expansion becomes necessary. While the need for school expansion is not immediate, consideration is being given to the establishment of school impact fees at this time, so necessary funds for school expansion can build up gradually over a long period of time, to avoid the economic dislocations associated with last-minute fund generation to meet a crisis situation. The possibility of school impact fees as a condition of development is very preliminary at this time, and is not presently a constraint to development.

Summary of Housing Constraints

In Gridley, constraints to providing additional housing, a complete range of housing types, and upgrading the quality of housing, consist of the following (not ranked in order of importance):

Market Constraints

1. Improved land costs
2. Finance costs:
 - a. high interest rates
 - b. high down-payments
3. Limited multi-family housing
4. Limited option to use mobile homes (perceived neighborhood opposition)

Governmental Constraints

1. Developer fees for on- and off-site improvements
2. City policy to maintain Gridley's population growth at historic rates
3. Lack of City utilization of public assistance programs
4. Limitations on infrastructure capacities (sewer, drainage and water supply systems), and
5. Absence of an active Abatement-Rehabilitation program

While all constraints are operating simultaneously, each exerting its own influence independently, those exerting the most direct and immediate control over the availability of adequate housing for all Gridley area residents are:

1. High interest rates and difficult financing (coupled with low levels of disposable household income)
2. Limitation on infrastructure capacities, and
3. High costs of improved lots.

These are in order of relative importance. To a great extent the third constraint is a product of the second and of general, nationwide inflation.

Most of the other constraints are secondary; that is, if the above three were not operating they would not present problems. For instance, if interest rates, land and improvements costs were not so high, builders would feel (from a profit standpoint) more free to build lower-cost homes. Public assistance programs, multi-family housing and mobile homes would not be so important, and a City- or government-assisted rehabilitation program would not be necessary because families could afford to improve their own homes.

Many of the constraints listed originally are also secondary to nationwide economic conditions: inflation, unemployment and other economic imbalances have caused normal government services, such as Gridley's local housing Abatement and Rehabilitation program or the Federal assistance programs, to be curtailed at the same time as households' abilities to maintain their standards of living have been severely taxed. In the Housing Program section, emphasis will be placed on actions that the City of Gridley can take to respond to those constraints over which it does have control. Ways will also be discussed in which Gridley can help to ensure a full range of decent housing for its residents given some of the economic condition constraints over which it has little control.

SUMMARY OF HOUSING NEEDS

The existing and projected need within the City of Gridley for additional new housing, and for rehabilitation and replacement of existing housing units, is summarized and quantified in Table 42 below. This summary of housing needs represents the conclusions of the analysis contained in previous sections of this Housing Element Support Document. It is the end product of considerations regarding how rapidly Gridley desires to grow, preservation of the historical socioeconomic balance, the condition of the existing housing stock, and the degree to which housing needs for lower income households have been met through 1984. These quantified housing needs will serve as the basis for housing policy contained in the Housing Element Summary Document and will guide Gridley's processing of applications for new housing over the five year planning period 1984-89.

TABLE 42

SUMMARY OF GRIDLEY HOUSING NEEDS, 1984-1989

A. Existing Needs

1. **Overpayment:** need for assistance to 350 Very Low and Low Income households (mostly renters) who are paying more than 25% of their incomes for housing.
2. **Overcrowding:** need for larger units for 158 households.
3. **Habitability:** need to rehabilitate approximately 309 units.
need to demolish and replace approximately 24 units. These 24 new units are included below under projected new construction. (Note: These are both estimates and will change slightly when housing condition is known in more detail.

B. Projected Needs, 1982-1987

1. Build 97 new units by 1989 to accomodate growth at historic rates.
2. Demolish another 24 dilapidated units and replace with new units. This number is an estimate and will increase or decrease slightly when housing condition is known in more detail.
3. Build the total of approximately 121 new units according to the following distribution:

<u>Income Group</u>	<u>No. Units</u>	<u>Suggested % Duplex and Multi-Family</u>	<u>Suggested No. Duplex and Multi-Family</u>
Very Low Income	39 (includes 24 Replacement units)		
Low Income	0 (Actually -6 surplus* Units)		
Moderate Income	28		
High Income	60		
Total	127	100	30

*Note: The figures in this table reflect the 94 units of non-market rate housing and 41 units of market rate housing built in the City between 1980 and mid-1984. Six "surplus" (in excess of theoretical need) Low Income units were built in the period 1980-1984.

An approximately 75% - 25% mix of single-family units to duplex/multi-family units is suggested, to reflect the historic mix of housing in Gridley plus 14 percentage-point increase in the historic proportion of multiple-family units, to better accommodate non-market-rate housing needs.

REFERENCES

Literature

Butte County (1975)

Special Census: Cities and Unincorporated Areas: High School Districts

(1981)

General Plan, Draft Housing Element

California Administrative Code, Title 25, Sub-Chapter 4
Housing Element Guidelines

California Department of Housing and Community Development (1980)
Housing Directory

(no date)

Methodology for Calculating Lower-Income Overpayment.

California Office of Planning and Research (1978)
Economic Practices Manual

(1982)

Land Use Litigation Newsletter

(1982)

Paying the Piper: New Ways to Pay for Public Infrastructure in California

Chico, City of (1981)

General Plan, Draft Housing Element

Corning, City of (1981)

General Plan, Draft Housing Element

Gridley, City of (1977)

General Plan, Housing Element

(May 1982)

Subdivision Ordinance: Title 16, Sec. 16.03.010-16.03.020 of
the Gridley Municipal Code

(June 7, 1982)

Resolution No. 37 (1982 Series) including Exhibit A, "City of
Gridley Schedule of Fees"

(November 1982)

Land Use Goals Questionnaire

REFERENCES

Page Two

(November 16, 1982)
Ordinance 421: "...Amending Chapters 13.08 Sewer Fees and
13.12 Water System of the Gridley Municipal
Code..."

(January 1983)
Existing Land Use Map

Gridley, City of (March 1983)
Map of Proposed Zoning, with new density categories

(April 1983)
Community Development Survey

Housing Assistance Council, Inc. (1982)
HAC News

Lassen County (1980)
General Plan, Housing Element

U.S. Census Bureau (1970)
1970 U.S. Census of Population and Housing, Census of
Housing

(1981)
1980 U.S. Census, Advanced Counts-Butte County

(1982)
1980 U.S. Census, Summary Tape File 1A and Summary Tape File
3A-Gridley City, Gridley CCD, Butte County, State of
California

Persons and Organizations Consulted

U.S.

Farmer's Home Administration

Elmer Wendell
Francis Halchishick

California

Department of Housing and Community
Development

Frank Ramirez
Don Crow, Statistics
Bill Murphy, Element
Review
Cam Cleary, Element
Review
Carolyn Burton, Legal
Staff

REFERENCES

Page Three

Employment Development Department	Spencer Wong, Sacramento Office
	Ann Witt, Sacramento Office
	Warner Schenk, Sacramento Office
	Spencer Fields, Sacramento Office
	Joe Sunseri, Oroville/ Marysville Office
Department of Finance	Bill Schooling, Census Data
	Bill Balvanz, Census Data
	Elizabeth Hoag, Housing and Statistics
Department of Social Services	Joy Gee, Estimates
Franchise Tax Board	Al Desin, Analyst
Department of Economics	Dennis O'Connor
<u>Butte County</u>	
Council of Governments	Bill Turpin Laura Tuttle
Butte County Housing Authority	John Bowling, Director Gary Sannar, Section 8 Program Coordinator Belinda Ruval-Caba, Farm Labor Center
Assessor's Office	Ed Brown, Assessor Bill Weeks, Appraiser
Agricultural Commissioner's Office	Mike Stewart Nick Surjan
Farm and 4-H Advisor's Office Oroville, California	Jerry Smith Bill Olson
<u>Gridley</u>	
Gridley Bank of America	Ruth Scott, Loan Officer
King Realty, Gridley	Ruth King, Realtor

REFERENCES
Page Four

Gridley Department of Public Works

Jeane Simmons
David McEntyre

Gridley City Finance Office

Evelene Payne

Gridley High School District

Superintendent's
Secretary

Other

California State University at
Chico, Disabled Student Services

Paul Carlstrom,
Coordinator

Chico Housing Improvement Program

Nancy Brittain

Construction Industry Research
Board, Los Angeles, California

Ben Bardolado, Director

Pacific Community Services
Pittsburg, California

Celia Burger, Housing
Development Specialist

Northern California Health Systems
Agency

Jim Polizo

Northern California Independent
Living Program

Rocky Burks

APPENDIX A

1983 GRIDLEY COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT SURVEY

1983 GRIDLEY HOUSING SURVEY - HIGHLIGHTS AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary and Highlights

98% of all occupied housing units were contacted (1584 homes)

Only 2% of all homes contacted refused to participate (39 households).

The overall vacancy rate was found to be 6.4%.

There is a ratio of 60% homeowners to 40% renters.

About 20% of all housing units (309 units) are in need of major repair.

70% of Gridley's households are Low and Very Low Income, with 41% under the poverty level.

43% of all Gridley households are subsidized financially in some form by the State and/or Federal governments.

182 households are overcrowded (158 units) are living in a structure which is unrepairable or borderline unrepairable (24 units). (These same households are also paying over 25% of their incomes for housing.)

140 Low and Very Low Income households (all renters) are overpaying for housing but are not overcrowded and live in a sound or repairable unit.

Interpretation and Conclusion

1. Overcrowding: New Housing and Other Options

To alleviate the overcrowded living conditions evidenced by the results of this survey, and yet keep the overall vacancy rate within its presently healthy range of five to six percent, the City of Gridley can take the following actions:

(a) Within the target numbers of new units to be built per year recommended in the Housing Element, encourage larger units units, i.e., units with more bedrooms, not necessarily larger in floor space, to preserve affordability. This would apply to duplexes and multi-family units as well as to single-family structures. Since most of the overcrowded households are lower-income renters and many are presently overpaying for housing, preserving affordability of the units while providing for larger families is to be emphasized.

(b) Apply for funding for programs to assist lower-income families in expanding their existing structures. This

could be a part of a CDBG program package, and would preferably apply also to rental housing since many overcrowded households are renters.

(c) Utilize procedures which provide for the "Granny" unit, condominiums, or mobile home parks, providing the option of a smaller, more affordable living space for elderly occupants of large, older structures. This would have the additional effect of freeing up the larger structures for occupancy by families now residing in units too small for their needs.

2. Rehabilitation, Financing and Rental Assistance

The 140 Low and Very Low Income households which are neither overcrowded nor living in a dilapidated unit are nevertheless overpaying for housing; many of these units also need major repair. Rental and mortgage assistance such as the Federal Section 8 program, and rehabilitation assistance such as the State CDBG program, can be used to avoid construction of unnecessary new housing, and to meet these households' needs while conserving existing housing stock.

1983 CITY OF GRIDLEY

Community Development Survey Statistics

The following is the base information established in the 1983 City of Gridley Community Development Survey, conducted city-wide during the Month of May (8th-20th) and hereby published June 1st, 1983.

- I. Total units contacted - 1584 (98% of the 1622 occupied units in the City).
 - a. Households personally contacted and information received - 1358 (86%).
 - b. Household information not available due to resident absence during the survey - 77 units (5%).
 - c. Household information not available due to resident refusal - 39 (2%).
 - d. Vacant dwellings - 110 (6.3% of 1732 total units in the City).

OCCUPANCY:

- I. Owner Occupied 809
 - a. Occupant mortgage holders - 438 (54%)
 - 1. Under 65 years of age - 199 (45%)
 - 2. Over 65 years of age - 239 (55%)
 - b. Home buyers paying more than 25% of their income for mortgage pmts. - 224 (30% of 809)
- II. Renter Occupied - 549
 - a. Renters paying more than 25% of their income - 250 (45%) of 549)
- III. Total vacant units - 110
 - a. Vacant apartments, duplexes and single-family dwellings for rent - 67
 - b. Vacant single family dwellings for sale - 16
 - c. Vacant single family dwellings for sale or rent - 27

INCOME:

- I. Very low income (Households whose income is below 50% of the County median income level*) - 562 (41%) *\$14,700
 - a. Households with family members predominantly below 65 years of age 320 (57%)
 - b. Households with family members predominantly above 65 years of age 242 (43%)

Low income (Household whose income is below 80% of the County median income level yet above 50%) - 399 (29%)

- a. Households with family members predominantly below 65 years of age - 293 (73%)
- b. Households with family members predominantly above 65 years of age - 106 (27%)

Moderate Income (Households whose income is between 80% and 120% of the County median income level) - 142 (10%)

Households whose income is above 120% of the County median income level - 199 (15%)

DERIVELY/HANDICAPPED:

Total households occupied by one or more persons over the age of 65 - 397

- a. Households with one or more persons who is over 60 years of age (not over 65) - 86
- b. Households with one or more persons who is over 65 years of age (but less than 75) - 195
- c. Households with one or more persons who is over 75 years of age - 202

I. Total households occupied by one or more disabled or handicapped person - 186

NOTE: The term disabled, for the purpose of this survey will refer to a physical or mental condition which restricts an individual to the point where he/she is recognized by State/Federal agencies as unable to perform in a traditional occupational capacity and is therefore receiving an income subsidy. (Head of household).

NOTE: The term handicapped, for the purpose of this survey will refer to a physical condition which restricts an individual to a point of immobility, limited mobility by means of aids (wheelchair, safety bars, etc.) blindness, or deafness.

- a. Total households whose head is disabled - 133
 1. Disabled person below the age of 65 - 68
 2. Disabled person above the age of 65 - 65
- b. Total households occupied by one or more handicapped individuals - 53
 1. Handicapped persons below the age of 65 - 13
 2. Handicapped persons above the age of 65 - 40



CITY OF GRIDLEY

Address _____ Single _____ Mult. Fam. (Inst.) _____ Duplex _____

Owner Occupied _____ Does payment exceed 25% of income? _____ Own _____
Renter Occupied _____ Does payment exceed 25% of income? _____

How long have you lived in Gridley? _____ How long in this unit? _____

"HOUSEHOLD INFORMATION"

Hispanic _____ American Indian/Eskimo _____ Eastern Asian - Islander _____
Black _____ Other _____

Number of permanent Farmworkers in household _____
Number of seasonal Farmworkers in household _____

Unemployed _____ 60 yrs _____ Female head of hstd. _____
Retired _____ 65 yrs _____ Employed in Gridley _____
Disabled _____ 75 yrs _____ Source of income _____
Handicapped _____

"HOUSEHOLD INCOME LEVEL"

# in fam.	6,600	7,550	8,500	9,450	10,200	10,950	11,700	12,450	12,100	13,850	15,550	17,300	18,400	19,450	20,550	21,650	15,150	17,300	19,500	21,650	23,000	24,350	25,700	27,050	Above
1																									
2																									
3																									
4																									
5																									
6																									
7																									
8																									

"STRUCTURAL INFORMATION"

Number of Rooms _____ Bedrooms _____ Bathrooms _____

Deficiencies:

Foundation: Maj.(6p) _____ Min.(1p) _____, Electrical: Funct. Def. (2p) _____
Sub. Inst.(2p) _____, Plumbing: Maj.(2p) _____ Fixture Def.(1p) _____, Roofing:
Maj.(2p) _____ Worn (1p) _____, Insulation: Attic (1p) _____ Walls (1p) _____
Weatherization: Chip./Weathered paint (1p) _____ Worn window sills/glazing (1p) _____
Broken windows (1p) _____, Sub. Chimney (1p) _____, Misc. Structural: Maj.
warped walls/sagging rafters (6p) _____ Damaged or missing struct. materials
(1p) _____, Cracked masonry(1-2p) _____, Def. porch or steps (1p) _____, Misc: Smoke
detector _____, No telephone _____, Deteriorated out-building/fence (1p) _____

Other _____

STRUCTURAL DEFICIENCIES:

NOTE: MSD Units - (Moderate structural deficiencies) - Structures determined to be deficient in 3-5 areas indicated in the structural portion of the survey.

NOTE: SSD Units - (Serious structural deficiencies) - Structures determined to be deficient in 6 or more areas as indicated in the structural portion of the survey or which have a major deficiency such as the absence of a foundation, warped walls or sagging rafters etc.

- a. MSD Units - 185 (12%)
- b. SSD Units - 124 (8%)

I. Total units determined to be in need of some degree of repair - 309 (20%)

MISCELLANEOUS:

I. Female head of household - 371 (25%)

- a. Female head of household below 65 years of age - 178
- b. Female head of household above 65 years of age - 193

II. Unemployment - Households whose head is currently unemployed - 125 (8%)

III. Households whose income is provided solely or in part by State or federal sources: 645 (43%)

IV. Hispanic Households (Spanish speaking, Spanish surname) - 130
a. Hispanic Renters - 55 (42%)
b. Hispanic Homeowners - 75 (58%)

ADDITIONAL STATISTICS: ^a VERY LOW, LOW AND MODERATE INCOME HOUSEHOLDS

1. Overcrowding = 158 (81 V Low, 59 Low, 18 Moderate Income) (12%)

2. Overpayment = 322 (214 V. Low, 88 Low, 20 Moderate Income) ^b (23%)

3. Dilapidated Structure = 24 Households living in unit with severe structural deficiencies. (23 are Low Income renters)

a) Very Low Income = below \$7350; Low Income = \$7350 - \$11,760; Moderate Income = \$11,760-\$17,640 [family of 4 assumed]

b) 159 High Income families are also overpaying for housing.

APPENDIX B

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE
POPULATION ESTIMATES
1983, 1984

SUMMARY REPORT

BUTTE

CONTROLLED COUNTY POPULATION ESTIMATES FOR 1-1-83

PAGE
DATE PRINTED 04/27/

CITY	POPULATION				HOUSING UNITS				OCCUPIED			PER HOUSEHOLD	
	TOTAL	HOUSE- HOLDS	MOBILE HOMES	GROUP QUARTERS	TOTAL	SINGLE	2 TO 4	5 OR MORE	MOBILE HOMES	OCCU- PIED	% VACANT	POP PER HOUSE- HOLD	POP PER HOUSE- HOLD
BIGGS	1417	1417	85	0	542	448	42	15	37	511	5.72	2.7	2.7
CHICO	28539	25992	51	2547	12352	6431	1649	4238	34	11495	6.94	2.2	2.2
GRIDLEY	4091	3999	14	92	1732	1482	98	145	7	1582	8.66	2.5	2.5
OROVILLE	9835	9561	273	274	4430	2635	497	1102	196	4199	5.21	2.2	2.2
PARADISE	23655	23118	3148	537	10471	7596	499	507	1869	9937	5.10	2.3	2.3
TOTAL INCORPORATED	67537	64087	3571	3450	29527	18592	2785	6007	2143	27724	6.11	2.3	2.3
UNINCORPORATED	86519	25955	15114	564	36927	24056	2434	2719	7718	33870	8.28	2.5	2.5
TOTAL COUNTY	154056	150042	18685	4014	66454	42648	5219	8726	9861	61594	7.31	2.4	2.4

SUMMARY REPORT

BUTTE

CONTROLLED COUNTY POPULATION ESTIMATES FOR 1-1-84

PA
DATE PRINTED 04.

CITY	POPULATION				HOUSING UNITS				MOBILE HOME	OCCU- PIED	% VACANT
	TOTAL	HOUSE- HOLDS	MOBILE HOMES	GROUP QUARTERS	TOTAL	SINGLE	2 TO 4	5 OR MORE			
BIGGS	1434	1434	85	0	549	455	42	15	37	518	5.65
CHICO	29708	26975	64	2733	12652	6606	1756	4256	34	11819	6.58
GRIDLEY	4188	4096	14	92	1764	1514	98	145	7	1618	8.28
OROVILLE	9914	9645	330	269	4443	2626	509	1102	206	4188	5.74
PARADISE	23924	23403	3257	521	10637	7670	524	507	1936	10014	5.86

TOTAL INCORPORATED	69168	65553	3750	3615	30045	18371	2929	6025	2220	28157	6.28

UNINCORPORATED	87962	87401	15552	561	37738	24460	2542	2759	7977	34402	8.84

TOTAL COUNTY	157130	152954	19302	4176	67783	43331	5471	8784	10197	62559	7.71

APPENDIX C

HOUSING BUILT
1983-1984
CITY OF GRIDLEY

APPENDIX C

HOUSING BUILT 1983-84

GRIDLEY BUILDING PERMITS, 1983-84

	<u>Date</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Number</u>
1983	4/26	\$ 27,500	3
	5/3	27,500	3
	5/26	23,150	1
	5/27	21,830	2
	5/31	21,820	1
	5/31	27,000	1
	6/1	26,180	1
	6/2	21,830	2
	6/2	26,180	2
		21,830	3
	7/14	75,000	1
	7/25	23,150	1
	10/21	21,535	2
		23,285	2
:	10/24	23,385	2
		25,835	2
	10/25	28,000	1
1984	5/4	27,500	1
	7/25	37,000	1
	12/6	32,800	1

1985	3/4	45,000	1
	5/29	90,000	1
TOTAL			35

Note: All units built 1983-85 are single-family detached homes.
Source: Gridley Building Department 10/85.

APPENDIX D

1984 BUTTE COUNTY (BCAG)
REGIONAL ALLOCATION
PLAN PROJECTIONS

TABLE 5

Household Projections by Year

	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990
Chico Total	25693	26525	27385	28272	29189	30133	31111	32118
Incorporated	11495	11854	12224	12605	12999	13404	12823	14254
Unincorporated	12662	13084	13521	13972	14438	14919	15417	15931
Durham	1536	1587	1640	1695	1752	1810	1871	1933
Oroville Total	12041	12427	12824	13235	13659	14096	14547	15013
Incorporated	4199	4323	4450	4582	4717	4856	4999	5146
Unincorporated	7842	8104	8374	8653	8942	9240	9548	9867
Paradise Total	10371	10756	11156	11571	12001	12446	12908	13388
Incorporated	9937	10308	10693	11092	11506	11935	12380	12842
Unincorporated	434	448	463	479	495	511	528	546
South County Total	4833	4990	5154	5322	5496	5675	5860	6051
Gridley	1582	1629	1678	1729	1781	1834	1889	1945
Biggs	511	530	550	570	591	613	635	659
Unincorporated	2740	2831	2926	3023	3124	3228	3336	3447
Other	8687	8977	9276	9585	9905	10235	10577	10930
County Total	61625	63675	65795	67985	70250	72585	75003	77500

Growth Rates

Chico	3.121%	Gridley	3.0%
Unincorporated	3.335%	Biggs	3.70%
Durham	3.34%	Unincorporated	3.334%
Oroville	2.95%	Other	3.335%
Unincorporated	3.335%	County Total	3.33%
Paradise	3.732%		
Unincorporated	3.33%		

Income Interval Cutoffs

Household Income Group	Calculation	Total	Total
Very Low Income	.28 x 57378	16066	16066
Other Lower Income	.16 x 57378	9180	25246
Moderate Income	.20 x 57378	11476	36722
Above Moderate Income	.36 x 57378	20656	57378
		57378	57378

Income Interval	Households	Cumulative Total	Total Needed Remainder	From Next Group	% Used
5000 - 4999	9348	9348	16066	6718	100
5000 - 9999	11852	21200	6718	5134	56.63%
5000 - 999	5134	21900	9180	4046	100.00
10000 - 14999	10219	32119	4046	6173	39.59
10000 - 14999	6173	32119	11476	5303	100.00
15000 - 19999	8082	40201	5303	2779	65.61
15000 - 19999	2779	40201	20656	0	100.00
20000 - 24999	5534	45735	17877	0	100.00
25000 - 34999	6061	51796	12343	0	100.00
35000 or more	4437	56233	6282	1845	100.00

U.C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES



C124889671